

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Founded by Nicholas Wiseman and others in 1836



ROME—OR DEATH

One Hundred Years Ago

By Sir Alec Randall

NEWMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH TWO CANADIANS

By the Rev. Laurence K. Shook

A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

Boris Pasternak and the Russian Tradition

By Victor S. Frank

Other contributors include John McLeish, Bernhard W. Scholz, J. Anthony Williams, Dom Patrick Hayward, C.R.L., David Lodge, Jean Rochereau, the Rev. John Berrell, S.J., and Donald Nicholl

LONDON

AUTUMN 1960

edited by A. A. M. VAN DER HEYDEN Hist. DRS. and H. H. SCULLARD
PhD FBA 'Lavish, scholarly, attractive, up-to-date ... dazzling list of specialist
 editors, contributors, associates.' *The Times Literary Supplement* 475 gravure
 plates, 73 maps in 6 colours, 60,000-word text, 24-page index. 14" x 10 1/2" 70s

L. H. GROLLENBERG A popular edition of *Nelson's Atlas of the Bible*. 'The illustrations . . . are of comparable excellence and extremely useful, while the maps . . . are not only clear but aesthetically attractive.' *Glasgow Herald* 200 gravure plates and 10 pages of maps. 11s

L. H. GROLLENBERG "Though called an atlas, it is in fact much more . . . Excellent maps printed in colour . . . interspersed with numerous photographs of ancient sites and modern scenes." *Jewish Chronicle* 35 maps in 8 colours, 2 end-paper maps in 6 colours, 408 photographs in gravure, 60,000-word commentary, 26-page index. 14" x 10 1/2" 70s



29a Gloucester Road, London, S.W.7

KNightsbridge 7611

By the end of the year we shall have published about thirty new Catholic books. We invite you to inspect them in the bookshops—if you find any not in stock in the principal Catholic bookshops, they will no doubt be obtained for you. The prices ran from 6s. to 70s., and at those particular prices from Seeking God by Fr Bruno Scott James to The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy by S. J. P. van Dijk, O.F.M., and J. H. Walker—the first a little book on prayer in the great tradition, the latter a big book of original research on the Thirteenth Century.

Here are some of our other titles:

ECUMENICAL

Approaches to Christian Unity, by Père Dumont, O.P. Introduction by Henry St John, O.P. 258

The Churches and the Church by Bernard Leeming, S.J.

APOLOGETIC AND APOSTOLATE

Why Christ by the Abbot of Downside

The Mission of the Church by Charles Couturier, S.J.

LITURGY AND HISTORY

The Early Liturgy to the time of Gregory the Great by Josef Jungmann 508

St Peter and the Popes by Michael Winter

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

Sources of Christian Theology, Vol. II. Sacraments and Forgiveness.

On Penance, Extreme Unction, and Indulgences, by Paul F. Palmer, S.J.

The Discovery of God by Henri de Lubac, S.J.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Founded by Nicholas Wiseman and others in 1836

LONDON: THE TABLET PUBLISHING COMPANY LTD.

NUMBER 485 AUTUMN 1960

Price 6s., plus postage : Subscription 25s. per annum, post free : U.S.A. \$4

CONTENTS

Rome—or Death One Hundred Years Ago By Sir Alec Randall	195
Newman's Correspondence with Two Canadians By the Rev. Laurence K. Shook	205
A Matter of Conscience Boris Pasternak and the Russian Tradition By Victor S. Frank	222
Psychoanalytic Imperialism Freudian Methodology and Primitive Religion By John McLeish	227
St Edward's Title of Confessor By Bernhard W. Scholz	239
Catholicism and Jacobitism Some Wiltshire Evidence By J. Anthony Williams	245
The Austin Canons A Ninth Centenary By Dom Patrick Hayward, C.R.L.	255
Maurice Baring, Novelist A Reappraisal By David Lodge	262
<i>Le Dialogue des Carmélites</i> An Appreciation of the Film By Jean Rochereau	270

Books Reviewed:

- The Catholic Church in South Africa.* The Rev. John Berrell, S.J. . . . 274
Canu Taliesin. Donald Nicholl 285

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published quarterly, at the end of March, June, September and December.

All articles are copyright throughout the world, and may not be reproduced without the express permission of the Editor.

All communications, articles and books for review should be addressed to THE DUBLIN REVIEW, 14 Howick Place, London, S.W.1.

Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is regularly analysed for the *International Index to Periodicals* (H. W. Wilson & Co., New York).

Notice to American subscribers: THE DUBLIN REVIEW has entered into an agreement with University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, to make THE DUBLIN REVIEW available to libraries in microfilm form. Sales are restricted to those subscribing to the paper edition, and the film copy is only distributed at the end of the volume year. Inquiries concerning purchase should be directed to University Microfilms, 313 N. First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

Nihil obstat: JOANNES M. T. BARTON, S.T.D., L.S.S., *Censor deputatus.*

Imprimatur: E. MORROGH BERNARD, *Vic. Gen.*

Westmonasterii, die 2a Augusti 1960

ROME—OR DEATH

One Hundred Years Ago

By SIR ALEC RANDALL

IT WAS not until June 1862 that Garibaldi uttered his famous cry of 'Rome, or death', only to be repulsed by the Piedmontese army at the skirmish of Aspromonte on 27 August. Five years later he again marched on Rome, again to be repelled, at Mentana on 2 November 1867 by the Papal troops, powerfully assisted by the French. Not until the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome on 21 August 1870, as a consequence of the Franco-Prussian War, was the way to Rome open to the Italian Government. Yet, however slowly it matured, the question of Rome's becoming the capital of united Italy was, essentially, decided on 18 September 1860 by the victory of the Piedmontese army over the Papal forces. This battle, whose centenary we now remember, is not as a rule included among the 'decisive battles of the world', but it was truly an event of decisive importance in that it ended all hopes of the Pope's recovering any of the territory which the Piedmontese had, step by step, taken from him, and it greatly encouraged the hopes of those Italians who had, for some years, held that United Italy could not be firmly established except with Rome as her capital. These hopes had a temporary setback with the death of Cavour on 6 June 1861; and his successors, strenuous though their efforts were to bring about a solution by agreement with the Pope, met with constant frustration. It is an extremely complex story, supported with an abundance of material from the Italian side, but only recently illuminated from the side of the Holy See by the researches of Italian historians, above all Fr Pietro Pirri, s.j. It is doubtful if the complete and unreserved opening of the vast Vatican archives for this period, whenever it takes place, will alter the factual side of the story. But in any event the field of historical judgement remains open, and recent disclosures from the papers of Pius IX have enabled us to modify conclusions confidently advanced by certain

historians of the Risorgimento on a question which seems likely to remain bristling with points of controversy.

The purpose of the present study is a limited one; it is to summarize the progress of the 'Roman idea' in the last few years of Cavour's life and to indicate the attitude of Pius IX in that period.

The aim of uniting Italy with Rome as her capital was not new in Italian history. It was, we may say, the purpose behind the cry of '*fuori i barbari*' of the warlike Julius II—the last great Pope', Mazzini called him. It was the domination of foreigners, the various dynastic ambitions and long-established possessions in Italy, of which the Papacy was only one, though the most ancient and least challengeable, that delayed the accomplishment of the dream. Certainly the Papacy cannot be held responsible, as Macchiavelli held it, for the failure of Italy to reach national unity. National feeling came late to Italy as it did to Germany; the Congress of Vienna set its seal on disunity in both cases. Away in St Helena Napoleon was to prophesy that Italy would one day be free within her well-defined natural limits, from the Alps to the sea, with Rome undoubtedly chosen as her capital, but meanwhile the part Austria had played in his defeat was too great for the statesmen of the nations that had struggled so long against the Emperor to wish to deprive her of any of her Italian possessions. No single State or dynasty emerged in Italy with the will or the strength to subdue the rest and expel Austria as an indispensable preliminary to establishing a united Italy. What everyone now sees as a natural and desirable development—or almost everyone, for there are some who still regret the Bourbons!—did not present itself as such then. It could only have been attempted at the cost of war, civil and perhaps European, and everyone had had enough of war. It would have been regarded as deliberate aggression against the territory of independent sovereigns, above all of the Pope. His States were consecrated by many centuries of tradition and were regarded universally as guaranteeing his spiritual independence. The Papacy was the subject after the Napoleonic wars of general respect and sympathy, not least in England because of the Pope's courageous resistance to the Emperor. Moreover, if such an aggression could have been carried out, who would benefit? There was no claimant; Piedmont was not ready to take up her role.

United Italy therefore remained an ideal for a small élite,

such as Manzoni, whose image of the Bonaparte conqueror was very different from that in the minds of the war-weary British, Austrians, Germans and Russians. Like Hilaire Belloc in our own time, it was Napoleon the liberator and would-be unifier of Italy whose failure such men as Manzoni mourned. The first important move to repair that failure actually came from Pius IX, though when his liberal concessions opened the way to licence, and his defensive alliance with other Italian princes promised to involve him in an offensive war against a Catholic Power, he drew back. Mazzini, disillusioned, or thwarted in his aim of using the Papacy to promote his grandiose ideals, co-operated in setting up the Roman Republic. His far-reaching plans for Rome had been expressed in exalted language. The Eternal City was to be not only the seat of a free Italian republic, but the unifying centre of a united Europe, giver to mankind of a new religion. This rhetoric was completely out of touch with reality, whatever glow of sentiment it might arouse in young Italians; it evoked no effective practical response anywhere, not even in Italy. Only France responded, and negatively. She was determined that Austria, in restoring order and the Papacy, should not establish herself in the centre of Italy. Hence Oudinot's expedition to Rome; hence Garibaldi's heroic but vain defence of the Roman Republic, and the unconditional restoration of Pius IX to Rome in 1850. Henceforward the Papacy was caught between the age-long rival Powers of France and Austria. It relied on them to maintain the integrity of the Papal States, and eventually on France alone for preserving Rome from seizure by the Italian Kingdom. This dependence was regarded as a disagreeable necessity, and the Pope more than once tried to rid himself of it.

The first practical plan for ending the Pope's temporal sovereignty and taking possession of Rome may perhaps be dated from six o'clock in the morning of 12 September 1856, when Cavour summoned La Farina to a secret talk. The Piedmontese statesman, whose skilful use of human instruments was a notable part of his political genius, encouraged his friend Farina from Sicily in forming the National Society. It wove a network of organization all over Italy, and played an important part in unification. At the time Cavour was too cautious to commit himself to it openly. He said to Farina, 'Italy will be a unified State with Rome as her capital.' But he added that Farina must come and see him secretly, and that, if he, Cavour, were challenged about

this alliance, he would, like St Peter, deny it and say 'I know not the man'. Rome then seemed too far off and difficult a goal to concentrate on; there were more urgent and practicable tasks nearer to hand. Above all, the support of Napoleon III had to be gained and kept, with a view first to expelling the Austrians, then to securing, for Piedmont, in the interests of an independent, united Italy, as much of the rest of Italian territory as could be absorbed or conquered without danger to the success of the whole enterprise.

Cavour had early realized that the formula, '*L'Italia farà da sé*', could only lead to disaster, as it had at the battle of Novara in March 1849. His energies were therefore directed first to making Europe familiar with his own, much-loved small State of Piedmont, and aware of Italy's case for freedom; second to obtaining reliable allies. His first aim was achieved by the alliance with France and Great Britain in the Crimean War, and the small but gallant share of the Piedmontese troops in the fighting. This established a claim on French and British gratitude, and at the subsequent conference in Paris Cavour succeeded, behind the cover of Lord Clarendon, whom he had carefully coached, in exposing Italy's complaints against Austria and the Papacy. Clarendon's emphatic words—he declared that the Papal government was the worst in Europe—gave much satisfaction to Cavour, but he perceived, as Clarendon later asserted, that they carried no promise of action. Great Britain was not willing to risk war, least of all merely to disturb the balance set up at Vienna. For France, on the other hand, it became, after Louis Napoleon had proclaimed himself Emperor in November 1852, a fundamental aim to alter the Vienna settlement. Anxious though he was to be accepted among the old monarchies, Napoleon III was no less determined to remake the map of Europe on national lines, and so establish the preponderance of France, largely at the expense of Austria.

For Napoleon III it is claimed that it was he who initiated and planned the successive moves towards Italian independence and unity. If so, he had in Cavour an alert, resourceful ally of a political genius unsurpassed in nineteenth-century Europe except perhaps by Bismarck. From 1855, when one day Napoleon told Cavour to let Walewski (the Foreign Minister) know 'what I can do for Italy', there was, with few exceptions, a constant communication between the Emperor and Cavour, either direct or

through faithful intermediaries in Paris. At their most decisive meeting, at Plombières on 21 July 1858, they planned in detail the joint war against Austria which Austrian ineptitude and Cavour's ingenuity made inevitable. The result of the victory, the Peace of Villafranca, merely awarded Piedmont Lombardy, and proclaimed the Pope 'honorary President' of a Central Italian confederation—a position which the Pope, who had not been consulted, would not accept. Cavour was beside himself with anger at what he considered so meagre a reward for so much bloodshed, but before long he could exclaim 'Blessed be the Peace of Villafranca', because it had shown itself unworkable, had aroused strong nationalist reactions in the rest of Italy, and because it became clear that Napoleon could be brought to acquiesce in further penetration and expansion by Piedmont into the Papal States—Romagna, the Marches and Umbria.

Deeply committed though Napoleon was to Victor Emmanuel and Cavour, he no less felt himself bound, within certain limits, to the Pope. Whatever his private sentiments about the Temporal Power—and he once exclaimed that he regretted the restoration of the Pope more than any other political act of his life—he constantly, in letters to Pius IX, asserted his devotion, both as a Catholic and as a champion of the Pope's true interests. The Pope's replies were usually polite, but also ironical, and sometimes he could bitterly contrast the Emperor's words with his inaction in the face of the spoliation to which he was being subjected. The Pope was deeply convinced that his States were a guarantee of spiritual independence; he took a serious view of his oath to maintain them, and though his feelings of pride as an Italian broke through now and then, he held that the sovereignty he had inherited could not be alienated without harm to the Catholic religion.

The vast majority of Catholics, outside Italy at any rate, shared these convictions. In Italy itself there were many troubled consciences; even fervent patriots were torn between national pride and misgivings over the morality of Cavour's methods, and their belief that to drive the Pope from Rome would ruin Italy. A good example of these scruples was Count Federigo Sclopis, whose *Secret Diary* was edited and published a few months ago by Fr Pirri, s.j. Sclopis was an eminent legal figure in Piedmont. His patriotism was unquestioned; he had played a leading part in drafting the Constitution, and later on he attained international

recognition by acting as the arbitrator between Great Britain and the United States over the *Alabama* case. He was on excellent terms with Victor Emmanuel and Cavour, but his devout conscience drove him to disapprove of Cavour's bargain with Napoleon, the sacrifice of the sixteen-year-old Princess Clotilde to the licentious Prince Napoleon, Louis's cousin, and the promotion of the war with Austria. As for encroaching on the Pope's domain he was glad he had no responsibility for it, and he refused to undertake a mission to Pius IX, knowing that negotiations on Cavour's lines would not be acceptable in Rome.

It was, however, not Italian consciences but French that occasioned Napoleon's caution over Rome. With such a character as his it is difficult to be sure of motives and assess any degree of sincerity, but there was no doubt about his concern with the French Catholic electorate, and his distaste for promoting a strong Italy which might escape French tutelage and might even be strong enough to upset the balance of forces in Central Europe. These were (in addition, perhaps, to respect for Pius IX's benign character) solid elements in Napoleon's determination to keep the Pope as an independent sovereign, whatever the size of the territory to which he might be reduced.

Cavour's sincerity seems to us rather easier to disengage from the tangle of stratagems and tortuous negotiations by which he sought to reach his aim. Except that Cavour did not scruple to use the forces of revolution—Garibaldian forces, that is—when it suited him, he could hardly be called a revolutionary, at least in a social or religious sense. He constantly thwarted Mazzini's conspiracies. This Pius IX did not appreciate; he always classed Cavour with Mazzini and Garibaldi as revolutionaries. A sense of grievance on the Pope's part was natural. Cavour had supported a series of anti-clerical laws in Piedmont; he had made arrangements about the Pope's territory without consultations with Rome; he had planned a series of encroachments on Papal territory, which the Pope legitimately possessed, and which had not committed any aggression and were, moreover, not so badly governed in the circumstances as Piedmontese propaganda declared. Beyond all this was Pius IX's complete lack of confidence in Cavour's good faith. His efforts to reach an understanding with Pius, which always fell short of recognition of Papal sovereignty, were regarded by the Pope as mere parliamentary manoeuvres. A document conveyed to him from Cavour was put away in the Pope's archives

with the comment, '*Mene Cavouriane*' (Cavourian tricks). It was not all due to Antonelli's influence. No doubt Pius, whose intense devotion to the spiritual side of his office made his reign one of the most notable in the Church's history, was glad to leave a good deal of the political side to Antonelli and the nuncios. But he had, as we can see from Fr Pirri's recent disclosures, a more direct part in the negotiations than has been generally acknowledged. He felt bewildered and betrayed in such a position as his. He had no material force; he resented his dependence on France even when he felt he could trust it; his economic resources dwindled as more and more territory was taken from him. He faced an opponent of supreme opportunist skill who used, as well as being propelled by, the new explosive force of nationalism. How could the Pope, except for his trust in Divine Providence, be sure this would not cause schism or even drive him from Rome? As for Cavour's formula, 'A free Church in a free State,' he could not accept it in Rome's special conditions; even the authority Cavour got it from, the fervent liberal Montalembert, repudiated it as applied to Rome, in replies to Cavour dated 25 October 1860 and in April 1861. In reality, he said, Cavour offered only '*une Eglise dépouillée dans un Etat spoliateur*'.

Yet it seems evident that Cavour, like his successors, wished to reconcile the two apparent irreconcilables, a united Italy with Rome as capital and a Papacy contented with treaty rights to possession of 'the Vatican surrounded by a garden'. To promote a schism was far from Cavour's intention. Mazzini's visionary 'Religion of Humanity' was foreign to his sceptical temperament. Though brought up a Catholic he came under Protestant and anti-clerical influences in his earlier years, but he was later not basically hostile to the religion of Rome. He numbered with pride St Francis de Sales in his family tree; he appreciated parish priests, helped nuns in their social work and built chapels on his estate. As we shall see, he also decided—from whatever inner conviction who can say?—not to die outside the Faith. Personal religious belief apart, his practical statesman's mind saw that the Papacy and the Church were a national and an international force to be reckoned with seriously; more, the Papacy was an institution with a glorious history in which he took pride, and Italy's prestige would suffer if cut off from its traditions. Accordingly Cavour was impatient to find a solution. He never went to Rome himself, but his and Victor Emmanuel's emissaries—a long succession—

effected certain adjustments, the filling of vacant sees, for example. But a basic reconciliation eluded Cavour. There were three obstacles: the Pope's intransigence, who insisted that in any negotiations the question of restitution should be included; the obstinacy of Napoleon III, who could be pushed into Piedmontese conquests up to a certain point, but was adamant on Rome; and, finally, Garibaldi.

Had Cavour been able to do as he planned, he would, it seems, have worked from north to south, expelling the Austrians from Lombardy and Venetia, absorbing all Central Italy, with an accommodation with the Pope, before he tackled the Bourbon South, who were under the patronage of Russia. This scheme was ruined by Garibaldi. Cavour feared that he, in his anger over the cession of Nice—his birthplace—and Savoy, would turn north. He therefore connived at Garibaldi's celebrated March of the Thousand in May 1860. The conquest of Sicily and the march on Naples showed Cavour that a force had been set in motion that could be diverted only by a supreme stratagem. Cavour himself had doubts about its morality, and modern historians are divided between those who think it a crowning act of political genius (Trevelyan), and those who find it morally indefensible (Whyte and D. Mack Smith). Antonelli's opinion at the time may be quoted:

Piedmont came into Papal territory saying they wanted to oppose the republic in Naples; they began by crushing our tiny army, and ended by keeping four-fifths of our territory.

The only defence is that Cavour felt he could only prevent the fire Garibaldi had kindled from sweeping over the whole country by controlling it himself. Otherwise the alliance with Napoleon would be ruined, there would be civil war and Italy would be isolated in Europe. Hence his intrigue to control Naples—conducted while Neapolitan envoys were treating at Turin! Hence the decision to stop Garibaldi's advance on Rome and meet and defeat the forces which the Pope, at the instance of Mgr de Mérode, but against the misgivings of Antonelli, had assembled under the command of the heroic but anti-Napoleon and exiled General de Lamoricière, who proposed to defend the rest of Papal territory outside Rome and its immediate neighbourhood. A mixed force of Italian, French, Austrian and Belgian volunteers, about 8000, was no match for the Piedmontese army of 50,000

under General Cialdini, who had lately seen Napoleon at Chambéry, and knew that the help from France which Lamoricière expected would never come. There was courageous individual fighting, but also much panic, and Lamoricière was overwhelmed at Castel Fidardo.

Bitterly reproached by the Pope for failing him, Napoleon could only repeat Cavour's excuse, that it was necessary to forestall the forces of revolution. He refused recognition to the new Italian Kingdom which now Cavour was free to create with all Italy—after the usual plebiscites—except Rome and neighbourhood, and Venetia. The former was secure by Napoleon's action, the latter by England's unwillingness, for the time being, to let Austria be deprived of it. British diplomatic action was concentrated, through the unofficial representative in Rome, Lord Odo Russell, on getting the Pope to dismiss the French from Rome and rely on the Piedmontese forces. But neither the Pope nor Napoleon was to be cajoled. All Cavour's agents failed. One of the chief of them, Fr Passaglia, who had been used by Cavour's most active representative in Rome, Dr Pantaleoni, was told by Antonelli that the Pope would not give up his independence and become a Piedmontese Bishop; he was the ruler of a Universal Church. On 27 March 1861 Pantaleoni was suddenly expelled from Rome, and the elaborate attempt to bring the Pope to negotiation, whose involved story fills many pages, came to nothing.

Now Cavour's main task—and it overshadowed his death-bed—was to secure French recognition for the Kingdom of Italy. It came only eighteen days after his death. On 25 and 27 March, in two of his most notable speeches, he insisted once more on Italy's right to Rome, without which as her capital 'Italy cannot be constituted'. He added that there were two conditions, that it must be in concert with France, and that

the great mass of Catholics, in Italy and abroad, should not regard the union of Rome with the rest of Italy as the signal for the subordination of the Church.

Then, towards the end of May, the great statesman fell seriously ill. Knowing himself to be dying, he had summoned the friar Fr Giacomo da Poirino, from whom he had, in 1854, obtained a promise to come and give him absolution on his death-bed. Now, he told him, he wished it to be made known that he had asked for the Last Sacraments on his own initiative. The

Viaticum was brought to him with all the devout observance of the crowd that is customary in Italy. When the circumstances of Cavour's death were first made known in Rome Pius IX expressed satisfaction and ordered prayers. 'Let us pray for him,' he said; 'the mercy of God is infinite.' But it soon appeared that Fr Giacomo had given Cavour absolution without obtaining any retraction of those actions against the Church for which excommunication had been pronounced on 26 March 1860. The summons to the priest to come to Rome and explain was exploited by the extreme anti-clerical papers; one or two compared him with Galileo before the Inquisition, and hinted at torture. This is, of course, false, as is the statement that he refused Pius IX all explanation, taking refuge in the secret of the confessional. He merely said he thought he had carried out his spiritual ministry, and he was allowed to go quietly back to Turin. Since, however, he had undoubtedly offended against religious discipline to which he was subject he was prohibited from administering the Sacraments. This decree was rescinded by Leo XIII in 1881.

In January 1861 Cavour had admitted in a letter that he understood Pius IX, and realized that if he gave away an inch of his territory he would lose his moral strength, which lay precisely in refusing to admit the alienability of his States. And so Italy had to wait for nine years before Cavour's dream could be realized, and then another fifty-nine before the rest of what he declared to be his ambition, formal reconciliation with the Papacy, could be achieved. So long a time was necessary for a regular solution to mature, for the reconciliation of Italy's national claims with the complete and visible independence of the Pope, accepted as such by the whole Catholic world. We may, with Fr Pirri, question whether this could have come about had Pius IX surrendered and allowed his tiny State to be beaten down as were the other small monarchies of Italy.

NOTE

The following are the chief works used in the preceding essay:

- P. Pirri, s.J. *Pio IX. e Vittorio Emanuele da loro Carteggio privato. La Questione Romana*. 1856-64. Rome, 1951.
 P. Pirri, s.J. *Diario Segreto (1859-78) di Federigo Sclopis di Salerano*. Turin, 1959.

P. Matter. *Cavour et l'Unité italienne*; 3 volumes. Paris, 1922.

La Questione Romana negli Anni 1860-1. Carteggio del Conte di Cavour con D. Pantaleoni, C. Passaglia, O. Vimercati; 2 volumes. Bologna, 1929.

Il Carteggio Cavour-Nigra dal 1858-61; 4 volumes. Bologna, 1926-8.

Mazzini. *La Repubblica Romana del 1849*. Second edition. 1876.

Montalembert. *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*. Paris, 1863.

G. M. Trevelyan. *Garibaldi and the Making of Italy*. 1911.

A. F. Whyte. *The Political Life and Letters of Cavour, 1848-61*. 1930.

D. Mack Smith. *Cavour and Garibaldi, 1860*. 1954.

Acton: *Essay on Cavour in Historical Essays and Studies*. 1907.

NEWMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH TWO CANADIANS

By the Rev. LAURENCE K. SHOOK

THE deep personal influence of John Henry Newman on his contemporaries outside Britain has not yet been critically examined nor satisfactorily assessed. When such an evaluation is attempted it will have to take into account not only the impact of Newman's writings upon the general reader but his personal influence upon distant and casual correspondents many of whom must still be undiscovered. The following documentary items reveal Newman's contacts with two immigrants to Canada whose lives he deeply influenced, though in radically different ways. Neither instance can, in a consideration of the English-speaking world as a whole, be an entirely isolated example of the profound and far-reaching effect of the early writings, and particularly of the *Tracts for the Times*, of Newman and his Oxford associates.

J. H. NEWMAN AND JOHN STRACHAN¹

On 27 July 1839 John Strachan was appointed first Anglican Bishop of Toronto. He was not elected to the office by the suffrages of clergy and laity, as is now the custom, but was nominated by the Crown. The Letters Patent, dated as above, erected the Province of Upper Canada into the Bishopric of Toronto and appointed John Strachan, D.D., Archdeacon of York, as the first incumbent.² From his arrival in Canada at the end of 1799 until his death in 1867 Strachan's career was vigorous and stormy. There are those who have suggested that he left Scotland a Presbyterian and, in view of the political advantages certain to accrue, arrived in Upper Canada an Anglican. Actually, it is not easy to determine precisely his early religious affiliation, since his father had been non-jurant Episcopalian, his mother Relief or Scottish Methodist. In any case, Strachan took Anglican Orders after arriving in Canada and, ironically enough, spent much of his long life fighting a bitter rearguard action against the non-sectarian and 'godless' forces which ultimately removed the Church of England in Upper Canada (Ontario) from its early position of political, economic and religious domination. Family Compact, Clergy Reserves, University of Toronto, Public Education spell out Strachan's successive withdrawals from what had appeared superficially to be strongly entrenched positions. Throughout his entire life he found himself involved in bitter controversy, usually on behalf of unpopular causes, with the result that he has been left with an unenviable reputation, even among the adherents of his own communion. Justly or unjustly, he is described as headstrong, caustic, fiery-tempered, irascible, imprudent, ambitious—the antithesis of the ideal churchman. It is refreshing to observe, in view

¹ John Strachan, b. 12 April 1778, in Aberdeen, took his M.A. at the University of Aberdeen 1796. He also studied at St Andrews and taught school for a time while attending university. He emigrated to Canada in 1799, taught in Kingston, Upper Canada, and opened his famous grammar school in Cornwall. He received Anglican Orders in 1804 and took a curacy in Cornwall. In 1812 he moved to York (Toronto), becoming headmaster at York Grammar School and rector of York. He was a member of the Executive Council of Upper Canada, 1818-36, and of the Legislative Council 1820-41. In 1825 he became Archdeacon of York and in 1839 first Bishop of Toronto. He was instrumental in obtaining a Royal Charter for King's College, and was its president 1827-48. When the college was reorganized and the non-sectarian University of Toronto set up in 1850, he founded the Anglican University of Trinity College, becoming its Chancellor. He was rector of St James' Church, Toronto, 1813-67. He died in Toronto, 2 November 1867.

² These Letters Patent were published in Toronto by The Diocesan Press, 1842.

of the generally unsympathetic attitude maintained towards him, that his contact with Newman reveals, at least for a time, an almost unnoticed and largely unsuspected side of his character.

Strachan was in England during the late summer and early autumn of 1839 awaiting his consecration by the Archbishop of Canterbury when on 15 August he wrote to Newman as follows:

London 23 Sackville St.,
15 August 1839

My dear Sir:

I have found so much in accordance with my own heart and with my own principles in the *Tracts of* [sc. for] *the Times* that I shall be very reluctant to leave England for Upper Canada without becoming acquainted with the authors and thanking them in person for their able defence of the true Church and their eloquent and profound elucidation of the foundation on which she ought to rest.

When I went to Canada about forty years ago my notions respecting the Church, the Government, the efficacy of the blessed Sacraments, the Succession, etc., were crude and unsatisfactory. But it pleased God by reflexion rather than books, of which I had few, to improve my views on all these points so that when I visited this country after twenty-five years absence I found them fearfully correct when compared to those generally prevalent at that time in England. As a transient visitor I was silent but not discouraged and in the *British Magazine* while under its late pious and accomplished editor and yet more especially in the *Tracts of the Times* I was delighted to discover the results at which I had slowly and laboriously arrived carried still further and a flood of light let in upon them which I trust in God will never be extinguished. Having become better acquainted with you from your acknowledged works than with any other of the reputed writers of the tracts, I request your assistance in making me personally known to yourself and your associates in your invaluable labours to protect the Church from Popery on the one hand and dissent on the other. I return to Canada early in October and have many arrangements to make but I must find time to meet you at Oxford or any other place more convenient for you. It will be to me a source of permanent delight while travelling in the silent and primeval forests of my Diocese to have spent a single day nay even an hour with men whom I already love and admire for the inestimable services they have done to our beloved Church.

I remain My Dear Sir,
Yours Faithfully,
John Toronto.¹

¹ Draft of letter to Newman, from the Strachan Papers, Department of Public Records and Archives of the Province of Ontario.

Though Bishop Strachan claims, in the above letter, acquaintance with Newman through his 'acknowledged works', one cannot help noticing the close affinity between his stated theological positions and those set forth in the first two numbers of the *Tracts for the Times*, both as we now know contributed by Newman. Indeed, Strachan speaks in his opening sentence of the accord between his own principles and those expressed in the *Tracts*; he then specifies these items of concordance: Church, Government, Sacraments, Succession.

These matters had been occupying Strachan's attention for about twenty-five years in two separate arenas. First, he had battled unsuccessfully in the Legislative Council to force the Government to recognize the Church of England, and only the Church of England, as the Protestant Establishment in Canada, alone entitled to the endowment and subsidies provided for the 'Protestant Clergy' by The Canada Act or, as it was known in Canada, The Constitutional Act of 1791. At the same time he insisted, in Council, on the complete liberty of the Church from interference of any kind on the part of the Government. Secondly, in articles written or edited for *The Christian Recorder*,¹ he took a position on the Sacraments and the Apostolic Succession not unlike those stated by the Oxford writers. Thus he must have read passages like the following in the first two Tracts with considerable gratification:

'Are we content to be accounted the mere creation of the State, as schoolmasters and teachers may be, or soldiers or magistrates, or other public officers? Did the State make us?'

'It is sometimes said, that the Clergy should abstain from politics. . . . Now there is a sense in which this is true, but, as it is commonly taken, it is very false. . . . There is an exceptionable sense in which a Clergyman may, nay must be *political*. And above all when the Nation interferes with the rights and possessions of the Church.'

'We know how miserable is the state of religious bodies not supported by the State.'

'As well might we pretend the sacraments are not necessary to salvation, while we make use of the offices of the Liturgy; for when God appoints means of grace, they are *the* means.'

'I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built—our Apostolical Descent.'

¹ *The Christian Record* was a religious periodical edited and in large part written by Rev. John Strachan, presbyter of York and published from York at the Upper Canada Gazette Office, 1819-20. Only two volumes appeared. The list of contents contain 'Writings of the Fathers', 'Frequent Communion', etc.

'It is plain that he [i.e. the bishop] but *transmits*; and that the Christian Ministry is a *succession*.'¹

Strachan's sympathy with many of Newman's attitudes is revealed in this first letter, though mainly at the practical and administrative level. As we move further into the correspondence, we shall see that Strachan was not unaware of that profound spirituality which imparted its particular flavour to everything Newman wrote.

Newman's replies to Strachan's first letter are but social formalities and are self-explanatory:

Oriel College, August 19, 1839

My dear Lord,

On my return to Oxford, which I had left for a few days, I found your Lordship's most kind and acceptable letter. It is a sufficient reward for any trouble or anxiety which the writers of the *Tracts for the Times* have experienced if they approve themselves to the Rulers of the Church. Dr Pusey and Mr Keble, to whom I will communicate your letter, will, I know, share in my feelings of gratification on reading it. They are neither of them in Oxford at this time. Mr Keble indeed lives in the country; and Dr Pusey is on the Devonshire coast. There are very few persons in Oxford at present, so that I can hardly recommend to Your Lordship to come down; though should you determine to do so, I hope I need not say it will give me very great pleasure to do what I can to make up to Your Lordship the absence of other people. I think it very probable that I shall be passing through London myself between this and the 6th of October; in which case I will not fail to avail myself of Your Lordship's permission to wait upon you, and I will inform you a day or two beforehand of my intention.²

Oriel College, Sept. 22, 1839

My dear Lord:

This is the first post by which I have been able to write word when I pass through London. I can hardly hope for the pleasure of seeing Your Lordship—but I will take the chance early on Thursday morning next.

My movements have depended on a friend who was going out of England by a packet, the exact day uncertain. Hoping this will account for my seeming inattention.³

¹ *Tracts for the Times*, by members of The University of Oxford (London, 1839), Nos. 1 and 2.

² From the Strachan Papers. Envelope notation: 'The Rev. John Newman. Recd 21 Aug. 1839.'

³ *Ibid.*

The outside of this last letter bears the following annotation: 'The Revd. J. H. Newman, 22 Sept. Called on 26.' It is to be gathered from a third letter that Strachan was not at home when Newman called on the 26 September:

Oriel College, October 11, 1839

My dear Lord:

Things have happened very disappointingly as regards my seeing Your Lordship. I have just returned to Oxford, and find your letter too late to avail myself of its offer. I did not recollect that I had mentioned the 4th of October in my letter to Your Lordship. The truth was I had to see an invalid friend off who was going to Malta—and his vessel went off a week sooner than had been originally appointed. I am now returned to our yearly audit and find that Dr Pusey is still at Brighton. I was much concerned to hear of Your Lordship's affliction. With the kindest and most respectful wishes and best prayers for Your Lordship's prosperity personally and in your momentous duties.

I am my dear Lord,

Your faithful servant,

J. H. N.¹

This exchange of letters took place between 15 August and 11 October 1839. The two churchmen never succeeded in arranging a meeting, as we shall see from a subsequent letter of Strachan's; but the Canadian bishop always felt that he had established some special *rapprochement* with Newman, as is evidenced from the unqualified statement of his personal secretary and first biographer that Strachan had 'personally known' Newman.²

One detects in the preceding exchange a deep preoccupation on Newman's part with other matters. It is not a case of his being cool or unfriendly towards the Bishop but of his having more absorbing and more disturbing issues to contend with. One of his preoccupations, as his last letter makes clear, was his concern over the health and departure for Malta of a friend, who can only be J. W. Bowden.³ But there was another and a far more serious matter. What it was is clear from a statement in the *Apologia*:

About the middle of June [1839] I began to study and master the history of the Monophysites. I was absorbed in the doctrinal

¹ Ibid. There is no draft of the letter from Strachan to which Newman refers in this letter.

² Henry Scadding, *The First Bishop of Toronto: A Review and a Study* (Toronto, 1868), p. 17.

³ Anne Mozley, *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman* (London, 1891), II, pp. 282-3, 287.

question. This was from about June 13th to August 30th. It was during this course of reading that for the first time a doubt came upon me of the tenableness of Anglicanism.¹

Equally disturbing was Dr Wiseman's DUBLIN REVIEW article on 'Anglican Claims',² which he seems to have read sometime between 15 September and 22 September. Newman's second and hurried note to Strachan was written on the same day, 22 September, as the memorable letter to Rogers in which he revealed a serious break in his defences:

Since I wrote you I have had the first real hit from Romanism which has happened to me. R. W., who has been passing through, directed my attention to Dr Wiseman's article in the new 'DUBLIN'. I must confess it has given me a stomach-ache. You see, the whole history of the Monophysites has been a sort of alterative, and now comes this dose at the end of it. It certainly does come upon one that we are not at the bottom of things. At this moment we have sprung a leak; and the worst of it is that those sharp fellows, Ward, Stanley and Co., will not let one go to sleep on it. *Curavimus Babylonem et non est curata* was an awkward omen. I have not said so much to anyone. . . . It is no laughing matter. I will not blink the question. . . .³

Bishop Strachan returned to Toronto, as planned, in October. Some six months later he had occasion to write to Newman again, this time to introduce one of his chaplains who was crossing to England to receive his M.A. at St John's, Cambridge.⁴ His letter is a valuable one in many ways, but most of all because it states so unequivocally the Canadian bishop's conviction that Newman and his colleagues were exerting a profound spiritual influence on his own church. It is excellent evidence of an awareness of Newman's personal sanctity in the world at large. Newman could have had no interest in the sectarian ecclesiastical politics gnawing at the heart of Canadian statehood, but he must have read with pleasure several of the theological and spiritual positions so strongly affirmed by the Bishop. Strachan's letter runs as follows:

¹ J. H. Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, 1st ed. (London, 1864), p. 208. All references to the *Apologia* are to this edition.

² Dr Nicholas Wiseman, 'The Anglican Claim of Apostolic Succession', DUBLIN REVIEW, VII (1839), pp. 139-80.

³ Anne Mozley, *Letters*, II, p. 286.

⁴ Henry Scadding, 1813-1901, b. Dunkswell, Devon, England; emigrated to Canada 1821; ordained C. of E. 1839; M.A. St John's College, Cambridge, 1840. He was rector of Holy Trinity, Toronto, 1847 to 1875, when he retired to devote himself to local history.

Toronto, Upper Canada, 22 May 1840

My Dear Sir:

This will be delivered by the Rev. Henry Scadding of St John's, Cambridge, who goes to England to take his degree of M.A. You will find him intelligent, pious, modest and unassuming. I have just appointed him one of my Chaplains. He is aware of the high opinion which I cherish for you and your friends and of the vast benefit which your labours are conferring upon the Church we love and requested a note of introduction.

The sound principles which your writings and those of your friends are disseminating in England are rapidly gaining ground in the United States and this Province. We have a weekly journal under the direction of a beneficed clergyman which during its continuance of three years has done much good in spreading the distinctive principles of the Church of England, and removing the prejudices and mistatements which the Dissenters publish and foster against her. We are gaining ground very rapidly and many of my clergy, who were rather low in their opinions on the Sacraments and sacred character of the Church are very much changed for the better.

Soon after I arrived from England, the Governor-General, C. Poulett Thomson, arrived to meet the Provincial Parliament in order to obtain their consent to a union of the Province of Lower Canada.

As such a union virtually places the two Canadas under a Popish Legislature I found myself under the necessity of opposing it when the resolution in its favour passed the Legislative Council [and] to enter my Protest.

The moment that the union was disposed of the Governor-General produced a bill by his Solicitor-General disposing of the Clergy Reserves in Church property. It robs her of threequarters, it degrades her (as far as human enactment can degrade) to an equality with all sects and gives the Presbyterians whose numbers it purposely swells by adding to the members of the Church of Scotland and another division of Presbyterians an equal portion with the Church of England. The remaining half of the property is given to all the sectaries within the Province in proportion to their respective numbers. There are seventeen or eighteen such Divisions. Some deny the sacraments. Some the Trinity. Others seem to have no religious principles, but merely call themselves Christians. You may readily suppose that I gave every opposition in my power to this iniquitous measure when it passed. I warned our friends in England of its turpitude and corrupt influence by which it was carried that it might be stopped in the House of Lords, and it requires the tacit consent of both Houses of the Imperial Parliament before it can become law. Having done all I can in this matter I leave it in confidence in the hands of God.

I trust however that while prepared to defend the exterior walls of the Church I am not inattentive to her spiritual objects which are infinitely more important. And I am happy to say that my

clergy in general are pious, diligent and active. Our people are rapidly increasing. From every quarter of the colony are applications sent me for clergymen and the strongest desire expressed for the ministrations of our beloved Church.

My last *Tract of the Times* is the eightieth but I daily expect all that may have been published up to April. I believe I have all your publications that were out before I left England. I am delighted with Palmer's Treatise on the Church and have read with benefit Gladstone's book. Nor do I feel inclined to quarrel with the Remains of the Rev. R. H. Froude. He was a noble soul and his death a great loss to the Church. A few years would have removed any little excrescencies and perhaps his spirit wishes that his Editors had softened those which appear.

I venture to remind you of a small work which I suggested in my last letter and believe me,

Yours Faithfully,¹

It is apparent from this long and informative letter that Strachan's enthusiasm was not entirely without misgivings. His implied and somewhat amusing criticism of the editors of Froude's *Remains* for not removing the 'little excrescencies' seems to be directed against what Newman describes in the *Apologia* as Froude's admiration of Rome, dislike of the Reformation and deep devotion to the Real Presence. Strachan had perhaps neither been able entirely to lay aside the Calvinistic prejudices of his youth nor to share Froude's sympathy for the Catholic Church. Nor, indeed, could he have quite forgotten the defection of John Elmsley, son of the second Chief Justice of Upper Canada, whose conversion to Catholicism in 1833 had so shocked Protestant Toronto.² Froude's *Remains* must have opened old sores, and it is not surprising that Strachan became a little chary about going all the way with the writers of the *Tracts for the Times*. The same admixture of enthusiasm and misgiving crept into the Bishop's

¹ Draft from Strachan Letter Book, 1839-43, p. 59, Archives, Province of Ontario. There is no evidence as yet that the original of this letter and of the following one were actually delivered to Newman.

² The Honourable John Elmsley (1801-1863) was the son of the second Chief Justice of Upper Canada. He became interested in Catholicism partly through his wife, Charlotte Sherwood, and partly through an English pamphlet (deriving ultimately from a work by the Rt Rev. J. T. M. Trevern, Bishop of Strasbourg) on the Sixth Chapter of St John's Gospel. While still a Protestant, Mr Elmsley had this pamphlet privately reprinted and circulated among all the clergy of Toronto, including his rector, Archdeacon Strachan, inviting rebuttal. After his spectacular conversion in 1833, the Hon. John Elmsley became one of Toronto's leading Catholic citizens. He served for many years on both Executive and Legislative Councils, and was in large part responsible for the founding of Catholic educational institutions in Toronto at all three levels.

first Charge to the Diocese of Toronto.¹ This Charge, which was not issued until 1841, provides invaluable evidence of Newman's widespread influence in the Church of England at this time. Parts of this Charge reveal the influence of Newman and his colleagues. The following are pertinent:

'At home, a great and salutary change has been effected in favour of the Church by the vast increase of fervour and activity in her members, by their rapid multiplication, and the revival of that holy and affectionate feeling towards her which characterized her early children' (p. 13).

'The people have been recalled from the dangerous theories of the age, falsely called liberal, which produce division in religion and anarchy in Government, to the sound principles of the Church as committed to her by the Apostles' (p. 13).

'This model of the primitive Church so beautiful and perfect, cannot fail to suggest that a departure from Apostolic usages and principles is the prolific cause of all the heresies and divisions which deform and disgrace the Christian world. This truth hath long slumbered, but is now coming into light, and, as it prevails, so will error and schism disappear. Some progress it hath already made in the hearts of those who are sincere inquirers after primitive truth, but its progress must be slow, for it is opposed to the pride of the human heart and the delight of the world' (p. 15).

'These evils (i.e. "low views of the Sacraments, and of the priestly office . . . neglect of obedience to the Church . . . Erastianism . . . faint-heartedness") were making great and alarming progress, when a few devout and learned men manfully and heroically came forward to stem the torrent, hopeless as the attempt seemed at first to be. Nor have they failed in succeeding to a great extent in the attainment of their object. They have been instrumental in reviving most important and essential truths, and in awakening the members of the Church to a higher estimate of her distinctive principles. They have called forth new and increasing energy in both Clergy and Laity. They have animated the lukewarm, regulated the course of the more zealous, and rescued the works of the ancient Fathers from the scorn of ignorance, and the pillars of the Reformation from oblivion. The tenor of their teaching has been like their lives, holy, meek, and consistent with the spirit of Christianity; and they have, by their writings, caused the voice of the Church Catholic to be heard through the whole of the British dominions. But while I readily accord a high meed of praise to men who have been thus active in producing a change so salutary in our Church, I by no means consider them perfect, or possessing any other authority than that of individual writers. Nor do I profess to agree in all their opinions, much less in some of their expressions. To avoid one error,

¹ John Strachan, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto at the Primary Visitation* (Toronto, 1841), pp. 13-17.

they have not at all times steered sufficiently clear of another; but it is our duty as Christians to judge by general effects and intentions, and not by incidental observations; and, in the present case, after making all the deductions which the most rigid justice can demand, an amount of merit still remains to which few writers can pretend.

'Such members of our communion, if indeed they can be called members, as are opposed to the recognition of any authority in the Church—to any divine title in the appointment of her ministers—to any deep and awful views of the sacraments—to self-denial, discipline and obedience—will condemn the writers to whom I have alluded, as promoters of unheard-of novelties and idle disputations: but those who believe and value the principles of Catholicity, will guard themselves scrupulously against general censure, even when lamenting and opposing particular faults. They will speak of such authors kindly and respectfully, as men engaged in the same good cause, and be more disposed to dwell upon their excellencies than their deficiencies.'

Two years almost to the day after Bishop Strachan's letter introducing Henry Scadding to Newman, he wrote a second introductory letter, this time on behalf of his secretary and examining Chaplain, Henry Grasett. This letter reveals the Bishop's continuing approval of Newman even though he had by now become, even in Toronto, a highly controversial figure. One thing, however, remains constant—Newman's reputation for holiness of life.

Toronto, Canada, 21 May 1842

Rev. and Dear Sir:

This will be delivered by my Secretary and Examining Chaplain, the Rev. Henry J. Grasett, who goes to Cambridge to take his degree of M.A. and prepares to visit Oxford. You will find him intelligent and well-informed and what is better, pious and devoted to the duties of his profession. Any attention you may find it convenient to show him I shall willingly repay to any friend of yours coming to this country. I gladly avail myself of this opportunity of renewing our acquaintance in writing as it has not been permitted to us to meet in person.

Tho' far distant I have not been altogether inattentive to the controversy occasioned by the *Tracts for the Times* and while I exercise my own judgement in approving or disapproving those I have seen (down to number eight-two inclusive) I am unable to account for its bitterness. I certainly am one of those who believe that the earlier numbers wrought wonders for our Church and revived in her a force never, I trust, to be diminished, that spirit of reverence for primitive truth and order which in many places seemed to be entirely forgotten. This alone is a benefit of the greatest importance and those who by their writings conferred it deserve our grateful

thanks. Moreover it is generally conceded that the writers so far as they are known are men of great ability and learning, earnest and disinterested in their views and motives, meek and amiable in their deportment, pure and holy in their lives. All this, which should have removed wrath and acrimony, appear rather to have increased them perhaps from the fear that men in every way so good and praiseworthy would by their example and writings acquire the greater influence. Be this as it may, I feel persuaded that the spirit of enquiry which you have roused will be ever richer for infinite good, tho' for a time it may be attended with some commotion.

I do not consider myself qualified to decide upon the points at issue and even if I were the requisite information is not within my reach. There are however some few matters which jar on favourite feelings. I regretted Dr Pusey's proceedings in Ireland tho' perhaps more than redeemed by his beautiful and affectionate apology. I do not and cannot accord with severe strictures on our early reformers nor with the tone not always dutiful to my Mother the Church of England—or with some palliations as they seem to me of the Church of Rome. Any union with that Church must remain hopeless while she adheres to the Canons of the Council of Trent and the creed of Pius the 4th.

You will be happy to hear that, blessed be God, we are doing much here and I trust in the right way. The true principles of the Church are daily gaining ground. We desire to be called after no man but to continue to nestle in the bosom of our Mother Scriptural and Primitive.

I have derived much benefit from your parochial sermons of which I have procured the first three volumes. If convenient, gratify me by a few lines by Mr Grasett or at your future leisure, for I regard not postage.

I remain Rev. and Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

John Toronto.¹

Strachan's private papers reveal no communication with Newman after this letter of introduction supplied to Henry Grasett. The diocesan Charges, however, continue to notice him and his colleagues. In the Charge delivered in 1844, Strachan can see no reason to depart from his earlier and sympathetic judgement on the Oxford writers. In so far as they 'brought forward doctrines warranted by Holy Scripture . . . they did good service. And this the more especially, because their teaching was illustrated and recommended by a conscientious zeal, a disinterestedness, and holiness of life'.² After 1845, however, the tone changes

¹ Strachan Letter Book, 1839-43, pp. 180-1.

² John Strachan, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto at the Triennial Visitation* (Coburg, 1844), ch. xxi.

abruptly to one of bitter vituperation. In 1847 the Bishop speaks of 'new enemies issuing from her [the Church's] own bowels', and of 'a simulation almost without parallel in the history of delusion'. Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine* is given special mention:

Even the last missile of their leader has fallen harmless to the ground. For what is development but the doctrine of doubt and hesitation, the exchanging of the rock on which the Church is built for the mists of the morning.¹

The Strachan-Newman correspondence, though largely unilateral, provides a vivid picture of the immediate impact of Newman's learning and sanctity upon one corner of the English-speaking world. Perhaps no area outside England itself was better able to understand and appreciate the real issues at stake. Upper Canada (particularly Toronto) was at that time predominantly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. Its Anglicanism, politically established, was meeting stiff opposition from dissenters and evangelicals. The Church of England there was panting for the breath of refreshing sanctity stirring behind the Oxford tracts. For Strachan and others Newman's unmistakable holiness had an initial appeal. It drew them as it drew Pusey and many an Englishman, as though by some irresistible connaturality, towards traditional communion. But Newman's holiness was too rugged, too non-complacent. 'Holiness rather than peace' was not to Strachan's liking. He had no countenance for the Tractarians if their holiness involved controversy:

Fortunately we have nothing to do with these proceedings and controversies. At peace among ourselves and sincerely devoted to our Church, her scriptural Liturgy and articles, as our bond of union, we are all of one mind: we act together in the greatest harmony as brethren embarked in the same holy cause; and are ardently prosecuting, under our Master's banner, the great work which in His mercy He hath entrusted to our care.²

It was to be many years before the Church of England in Toronto could again respond sympathetically to the name of Newman.

¹ John Strachan, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto at the Visitation in June 1847* (Toronto, 1847), pp. 35-6.

² *Charge of 1844*, loc. cit.

NEWMAN AND W. F. HARPER

About the year 1840 The Merchants' Bank in Canada, pursuing what was then well-established policy, brought out from England a young clerk by the name of William Francis Harper to work in its Kingston, Ontario, branch. The young bank clerk was interested, apparently, in the writings of the Tractarians, certainly in Newman and in William Palmer of Worcester College. Mr Harper ultimately became a Catholic. The parish files of Kingston record his marriage to Margaret Livingston 27 April 1846, and the baptism of his first daughter 8 February 1847, and of his second on 7 March 1849.¹ Shortly after this Harper was transferred to London, Ontario, where he managed the local bank until his death. Among his most treasured possessions was a letter he had received from John Henry Newman sent from Littlemore, March 1843. This letter is at present to be found in the library of St Peter's Seminary, London, Ontario.

Harper seems, so far as one can tell from Newman's letter, to have been reading William Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ* and to have come to the conclusion that in a place like Canada where the Church had been established from France so many years before, it was quite improper for the Church of England to set up rival sees. Thus Harper had written Newman asking whether he ought not, in Canada, to join the Church of Rome. The pertinent passages from Palmer must be the following:

We may infer from what has been said, that since unity of communion is the law of God, both in the universal church and in all the particular churches in which it is arranged, it is impossible that in the same place there can be several different churches equally authorized by God and united to Christ. . . . But what I contend for is, that in one locality there can be but one society whose communion Christians are bound to seek in preference to all others. . . . This conclusion is maintained by Cyprian in several places: 'The Lord himself teaches and admonishes us in his gospel, saying, *And there shall be one flock and one shepherd*. And does anyone imagine that there can be, in *one place*, many shepherds or many flocks?' . . . It is in these rival religious acts alone that the schism is completed.²

¹ Archives of St Mary Cathedral, Kingston, Ontario.

² William Palmer, *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 3rd ed. (London, 1842), pp. 48-9; cp. also p. 70.

Palmer's case for demonstrating that the Church of England was truly the Church of Christ in Great Britain was based largely upon his analysis of the British Reformation. Since the same conditions in no way obtained in Canada where the Church (albeit Gallican in his terminology) had been properly set up from France, the rival sees now being established from Canterbury (Quebec 1793, Toronto 1839, etc.), could only in this context be regarded as completing a schism. Whether Harper had also read Newman's review of Palmer's *Treatise* in the *British Critic*¹ is not clear. At any rate, he wrote Newman about this problem, as well as about other personal matters which it is impossible to reconstruct. Newman's reply is one of the finest letters to come from his pen, revealing as it does his tremendous sympathy for the young man who was a total stranger to him, and providing added insight into his own problems at the end of his first year at Littlemore:

Wm. F. Harper, Esqr.,
Kingston,
Canada.

Littlemore, Oxford, 15 March 1843

Dear Sir:

A letter like yours is very difficult properly to answer, because it is the letter of a stranger on a very important subject. It is scarcely possible that you should understand my words in all respects in the sense in which I mean them, or should understand the limitations or explanations which are taken for granted, in my use of them (as by all writers in all statements), and the arguments on which I should test them. And it is quite impossible that I should duly enter into your state of mind and modes of thought, so as to say what may be serviceable to you and expedient. Indeed I am afraid of doing harm, when my sole wish is to be of use to you—and this is a feeling which presses upon me in all similar cases, and makes me very reluctant to offer an opinion on important subjects to anyone I am not acquainted with. If anything wd reconcile me to it, it is your kind words about myself.

My will, I assure you, is not wanting. Your letter carries with it too many marks of religious earnestness and too many characters of interest not to make me very desirous to satisfy you on the points which form the subject of your enquiry, were I able.

Your statement is a very clear one and I quite understand its drift. In answer I will observe that I do not, I cannot, agree with Mr Palmer. The theory of but one Bishop in one place is quite inconsistent with the state of things in which we find ourselves. It seems to be very unreal and unmeaning, considering the historical

¹ In J. H. Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical* (London, 1895), pp. 179-215.

events of the sixteenth century. Then a division took place far greater than the irregularity in question—Rome and England then separated—this was a procedure far more disturbing and prejudicial to the Church's unity, than any reduplication of churches in one place can be, and *involves* such a reduplication. If Rome and England *are* separate, it seems preposterous that they may not provide for their own people—and it is in a way hypocritical to be shocked at an ecclesiastical irregularity while we can bear so patiently a near approach to formal schism. It is true, there *ought* to be but one Bishop in each place—but there *ought* to be but one communion in the Church—and if necessity justifies the breach of the latter, much more will it justify that of the former.

I think then it does not matter whether Rome is first in Canada or we. We each provide for our own people by a temporary arrangement till our differences are adjusted. It is the state of things in *the interim*, anomalous because our general position is anomalous. It seems to me therefore that you have nothing to do with the Church of Rome. *You* are in the Church of England, and you are bound (at least at first) to throw yourself generously into her system, and to make proof of its excellence by trial.

Considering what you tell me of your age, I think I have said enough for your present direction, should it approve itself to you. Through the Divine Blessing, let us hope, that if you give yourself up for the present to the English Church, you will see your way for the future more clearly. And you may be intended in your place to act an important part, with many others, in the revival of feelings long dormant, feelings of love, reverence, admiration towards the Church of Rome. In myself, whatever views I have expressed of the errors of that Church, I have ever, from the time I began to write, been forward in expressing these feelings also.

If I can say anything further on this subject for the relief of your difficulties let me beg the favour of a second communication from you.

I am, Dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
John H. Newman.

P.S. You will see that, in my opinion, you need not concern yourself with your oath at present—but I cannot doubt that it is an unlawful one, and invalid from the first. At the same time it certainly makes it an additional duty for you to be very circumspect in your proceedings with reference to the Church of Rome.

There can be no doubt Newman found himself embarrassed by Harper's letter. He had, only a few weeks before, written his 'formal Retraction of all the hard things'¹ which he had said against the Church of Rome. Now he must advise a sincere young

¹ *Apologia*, 325.

man 'to have nothing to do with the Church of Rome' and to give himself up 'for the present to the English Church'. His letter to Keble on 14 March, the day before replying to Harper, seems to reflect his quandary:

Another circumstance, which pressed on me painfully when I wrote you before, was, that what influence I exert is simply and exactly, be it more or less, in the direction of the Church of Rome—and that whether I will or no. . . . There was a time when I tried to balance this by strong statements against Rome. . . . But now when I feel I can do this no more, how greatly is the embarrassment of my position increased!¹

Then, as though to justify his contemplated resignation of St Mary's, he suggests that he may very well be occupied with another kind of pastoral work—'I mean that of direction (as best I may) the conscience of persons.'² Harper was surely on his mind, though hardly a difficult case since neither in orders nor church office of any kind. But he was part of that insufferable drama of these trying weeks when even his bishop was questioning him: 'It is hard that I am put upon my memory, without knowing the details of the statement made against me, considering the various correspondence in which I am from time to time unavoidably engaged.'³

We have in these two exchanges poignant illustrations of the radically different ways in which Newman's influence was felt in Canada. The case of Bishop Strachan is perhaps the more common: the painful experience of those who declined to go all the way with him in spite of their early esteem for his leadership; rarer and more sensitive is the case of Harper: essentially one of conscience, provoked by the disturbing issues connatural with the Tractarian Movement; their juxtaposition is a concrete instance of the 'loss and gain' which constitute the John Henry Newman drama.

*The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies,
Toronto, Canada.*

¹ *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others*, ed. Birmingham Oratory, 210.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Apologia*, 302.

A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

Boris Pasternak and the Russian Tradition

By VICTOR S. FRANK

The Board of the Literary Foundation of the U.S.S.R. regrets to announce the death of the writer and member of the Foundation, Boris Leonidovich Pasternak, who passed away on 30 May in his seventy-first year, and conveys its condolences to the family of the deceased.

THUS runs the complete text of the only reference to the death of modern Russia's greatest poet, as it appeared on 1 and 2 June respectively in the two professional writers' papers in Moscow, *Literature and Life* and the *Literary Gazette*. The national dailies and the literary monthlies ignored the event, and if it were not for foreign radio stations the great majority of Russians would have been left in ignorance of Pasternak's last illness and death.

The Literary Foundation, it should be explained, is an officially sponsored mutual benefit society of Soviet writers. Though expelled from the Union of Soviet Writers, Pasternak evidently remained a member of the society, which, be it noted to its credit, did its very best to provide the dying man with medical help during his final illness. And it was only the fact of Pasternak's membership that made it possible for the two papers to mention the fact of his death. A Soviet citizen without an affiliation to any State-run or State-sponsored body is an un-person. So the greatest lyric poet of post-revolutionary Russia went to his grave as a member of a mutual benefit society. . . .

One's mind goes back to some precedents in the history of Russian letters. When Pushkin perished after an absurd duel in January 1837, the papers, aware of the Tsar Nicholas I's displeasure, remained silent. One paper alone carried a short notice, which opened with words that were to become famous in the history of Russian literature: 'The sun of Russian poetry has set: Pushkin is dead, dead in the flower of his manhood, halfway on

the great road he was travelling on . . . ' The next day an irate censor told the editor: 'Why this fuss over Pushkin? Why this black frame around the obituary of a man of no official status? And what expressions! "The sun of poetry" . . . I ask you! Or: "Halfway on the great road he was travelling on". What road? Was Pushkin a general, a minister, a statesman? Composing verse does not mean "travelling on a great road".'

When in 1852 another great Russian writer, Gogol, died, Turgenev, his younger contemporary, published a tribute to him in a Moscow paper. Since he had not bothered to submit his script to the censor first, he was put under arrest and banished to his estate. He tells the following story in his memoirs:

A high society lady in St Petersburg thought that the punishment meted out to me had been too harsh. 'But,' someone told her, 'don't you know that in his article he called Gogol a great man?' 'Really?' 'I assure you.' 'Well, in such a case I withdraw my objections. I am sorry, but I realize now that he had to be punished.'

Throughout the last hundred and fifty years or so there has not been one really great writer in Russia who, at one time or another, for one reason or another, has not come into a conflict with the authorities, first Tsarist, then Communist. Pushkin, hounded by high society and finally driven into the duel; Lermontov, banished to the Caucasus; Dostoyevsky, sentenced to death, pardoned in the last minute and then sent to prison and to exile for ten years; Turgenev, spending the major part of his life abroad; Tolstoy, excommunicated by the Church. And after the Revolution—Blok, dying of broken heart; Gumilev, shot as a monarchist conspirator; his widow Akhmatova, howled down by Zhdanov; Mayakovsky and Tsvetayeva committing suicide . . . The list, which could be easily extended, now ends with Pasternak.

What was it that forced all really great Russian writers into a latent hostility towards the central power, and that compelled the State to treat them with wary mistrust and to fight them as if they were sworn enemies of Russia?

The explanation is that in Russia, to a greater extent than anywhere else in the West, the writer had to aspire to become a prophet (in the Biblical sense), to become a vehicle of the nation's conscience. And conscience is an irksome and meddlesome thing which we all tend to suppress if it speaks out too loudly and too consistently. It is a terrible thing to study the history of a great

nation without a conscience—say, that of the Assyrian Empire, or of the Mongol Hordes. Throughout the Christian centuries of Russian history, the princes and the Tsars, the rich and the noble, were exhorted and taught the fear of God by the Church. To speak out on behalf of the poor and for the vanquished was then the business of the Church.

When, under Peter the Great, the Orthodox Church had been turned into a Government department and integrated in the State *apparatus*, the voice of the nation's conscience was all but silenced. And the eighteenth century, the century of the greatest glory of the Russian arms, was perhaps the most heartless period of the country's history. It was towards the end of this century that a new sociological type began to arise and to claim the right to speak out for the 'insulted and the injured'—the writer, a man, that is, driven by a powerful impulse to try and mend the wicked and power-drunk world he belonged to. It is a strange symbol that one of Pushkin's most famous poems is one entitled *The Prophet*. The first and the last lines (in Maurice Baring's beautiful translation) are:

With fainting soul athirst for Grace,
I wandered in a desert place,
And at the crossing of the ways
I saw the sixfold Seraph blaze.

And with his sword my breast he cleft,
My quaking heart thereout he reft,
And in the yawning of my breast
A coal of living fire he pressed.
Then in the desert I lay dead,
And God called unto me and said:
'Arise, and let My Voice be heard,
Charged with My Will go forth and span
The land and sea, and let My Word
Lay waste with fire the heart of man.'¹

It is a strange symbol, because Pushkin himself was an eighteenth-century man by upbringing and inclination, with no metaphysical nonsense about him, sober and worldly wise. But even he could not resist the pull inherent in the Russian tradition.

There was with the decay of the Church a tremendous spiritual vacuum left in Russia. There was the Tsar, there was a

¹ *Have You Anything to Declare?* By Maurice Baring (William Heinemann, London, 1936), p. 246.

powerful bureaucracy and a powerful army—conceited and glittering with pomp and glory. There was an enormous and amorphous mass of people, backward, accepting their privations and sufferings with the incomprehending humbleness of a deaf-mute. And with the disappearance of the Church as a mentor of the strong and protector of the weak, there was nothing in between. So, to the everlasting glory of Russian literature, the men of letters set out to fill this vacuum.

Of course, this vocation became a pose in the case of weaklings and charlatans. Of course, there were tragic misunderstandings on both sides. But basically it remains true to say that Russian nineteenth-century literature as a whole became to the ordinary educated Russian a substitute for the Church. And if you visit an average Russian émigré club or library you will see its walls decorated not with the pictures of the saints, but with portraits of Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Chekhov and the rest of them.

Basically, too, the Tsarist regime was at a disadvantage. It disliked the irksome voice of conscience, but the means for its suppression at its disposal were those of an old-fashioned police-State. In the long run censorship and banishments, bans and arrests proved to be unavailing. A completely different situation arose after the Bolsheviks had usurped power in November 1917. Their methods were far more effective. If the Tsarist tyranny fought the writers' community from without, the Bolsheviks corrupted it from within. Those who refused to be bribed, brain-washed and integrated into the power apparatus were physically destroyed or exiled. The great majority had been cajoled and persuaded to make the cause of the central power their own. This was perhaps the deepest break with the pre-revolutionary tradition: the writers who had always considered it their sacred duty to plead for mercy and, if necessary, to fight the secular power, now had been impelled to plead on behalf of the same power for mercilessness towards its 'enemies'.

How was it achieved? Not by destroying the old institutions, but by preserving their form and by filling this form with a faded product. Take the example of the organization mentioned at the beginning of this article. The Literary Foundation was formed back in the 1850s, when dire poverty among writers was a sad reality. It was then a genuine attempt by the writers to organize a society to protect the professional and personal interests of its members.

The Literary Foundation is still in existence. It is now a richly endowed organization, which runs rest-homes and seaside resorts and enjoys Party support. It is now in effect a channel for awards to writers who have particularly deserved of the ruling caste.

Pasternak's case assumes a poignant meaning against this background. A less likely candidate for the position of a 'prophet' could not be imagined. Throughout his youth and his early manhood his art was the art of an esoteric lyric poet. The social theme did not appear on his horizon. His sincere attempts to make the cause of the Revolution his own turned out to be brilliant failures. In the middle of the 1930s he found a new and seemingly safe outlet for his genius—that of a translator. He acquired a new fame and a new sense of security. Even the 1946 Zhdanovite witch-hunt left him untouched. It looked as if he was able to achieve the impossible: to preserve his integrity as an artist and to live out his days in the Soviet Union basking in glory.

It was not to be. It was not to be because Pasternak, too, had heard the call of the 'sixfold Seraph'. He heard God's voice commanding him:

Arise and let My Voice be heard,
Charged with My Will go forth and span
The land and sea, and let My Word
Lay waste with fire the heart of man.

This is the spiritual genesis of *Doctor Zhivago*, a work which, with all its structural imperfections, is a triumphant return to the best in the history of Russian literature. Once again the voice of Russia's conscience had spoken out.

Munich

PSYCHOANALYTIC IMPERIALISM

Freudian Methodology and Primitive Religion

By JOHN McLEISH

THE characteristic weakness of Sigmund Freud as a scientific thinker lay in the indiscipline of his imagination and his reliance on intuition. The literary rather than the scientific character of his talents ensured that his first group of admirers were outside his special field of neuropathology (his *Interpretation of Dreams* was largely ignored by the scientific profession, while having a *succès d'estime* in literary and artistic circles). Because of the character and interests of the group first recognizing the importance of his ideas, Freud became caught up in a great variety of topics, many of which were not amenable to scientific investigation except in a very restricted way, some requiring a specialized knowledge and training which he lacked.

THE NATURE OF FREUD'S INTEREST IN PREHISTORY

The continuing hostility of the medical fraternity to his pan-sexual conceptions of the neuroses, combined with his discovery that his first work in the field of psychiatry was without objective basis, diverted Freud more and more from the medical to the literary and cultural aspects of his work. He never made any secret of the fact that his original interest in medicine as a career was very slight. Had his own psychological difficulties not attracted him to the study of psychopathology, it is doubtful if he would ever have practised after completing his medical course. With the development of the psychoanalytic 'school' and his achievement of the status of leading oracle Freud tended to lose his grasp on empirical realities and aspired to give a universal explanation of

art, religion, society, prehistory and everything else. He came to believe that the whole field of human knowledge belongs to science (in this context science means psychoanalysis). He says:

Scientific research looks on the whole field of human activity as its own, and must adopt an uncompromisingly critical attitude towards any other power that seeks to usurp any part of its province. Of the three forces which can dispute the position of science religion alone is a serious enemy. Art is almost always harmless and beneficent, it does not seek to be anything but an illusion. . . . Philosophy is not opposed to science, it behaves itself as if it were a science, and to a certain extent makes use of the same methods.¹

Freud's enmity towards Judaism was rationalized in his book on *Moses and Monotheism*, in which he attempted to establish that Moses was actually an Egyptian. His lifelong enmity towards religion in general was expressed in his study of *Totem and Tabu*. In this most characteristic contribution he attempts to point the resemblances between the psychic life of savages and of neurotics and by this means to arrive at an explanation of the origin of morality, religion and social cohesion in human societies. Incidentally, he attempts to explain the nature and origin of totemism in savage societies. The materials for this study are drawn from his own experience with neurotics and from the collections of material on savage customs made by those two other armchair students of primitive belief and custom, Sir James Frazer and Wilhelm Wundt. *Totem and Tabu* is not entirely a disinterested study of prehistoric anthropology. Freud uses selected data, as many others before him had done, to cover up a weakness in his general theory of human nature.

(A) TOTEMISM, TABU AND EXOGAMY

The phenomena which Freud undertook to elucidate in terms of psychopathology are amongst the most puzzling of human constructions. Frazer in his monumental *Totemism and Exogamy* reduced a mass of data from societies all over the world to something like manageable proportions. However, he had been quite unable to account for the phenomena of totemism, tabu and exogamy. Although capable of very wide variation the phenomena

¹ *New Introductory Lectures.*

are briefly as follows: Totemism is a system of social organization found amongst certain primitive races in Africa, America and Australia. The tribe may be divided into groups, each being named after an animal or plant found commonly in the vicinity (totems may also be artificial objects, natural forces or parts of animals). The members of a given totem are forbidden to eat or kill their particular totem. Totemism is frequently, although not invariably, associated with marriage prohibitions. Members of the same totem are not allowed to marry or to have intercourse with each other, but must marry individuals from designated totems. The totem is hereditary. Children after pubertal initiation usually become members of the same totem group as their mothers. At particular sacred seasons, in a tribal festival, the tabus about killing and eating are broken. The totem animal is ritually killed and eaten, and totem members may also break the tabu about sexual intercourse.

(B) THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX

The explanatory principle which Freud uses in this context is that which he uses in all other contexts, namely, the Oedipus complex. This refers to an unconscious development of libidinous desire on the part of the male child for his own mother, coupled with unconscious murder-wishes directed against his father. In the myth Oedipus kills his father without being aware of the relationship and commits incest with his mother unwittingly. Freud believed that there was a universal and natural Oedipus unconscious construction arising in the fantasy life of the male child at an early stage of development. This is presumed to be a necessary and inevitable stage in normal human development: it is 'a general human characteristic decreed by Fate'.

The importance of the Oedipus complex for the general theory of psychoanalysis cannot be overestimated. Ernest Jones, Freud's biographer and a member of the inner circle of his disciples, has said that 'all other conclusions of psychoanalytic theory are grouped around this complex, and by the truth of this finding psychoanalysis stands or falls'. Thus Freud's interest in prehistory is not disinterested, since it is here that the evidence for the origin of this 'general human characteristic' must be found. The argument of *Totem and Tabu* is therefore two-edged. One line

concerns the explanation of totemism and exogamy (and of pre-historic institutions in general) in terms of the ubiquitous family complex: the other line of argument is to explain the origin of this unconscious psychic construction in some memorable, unique, historical occurrence.

(c) THE 'PRIMITIVE HORDE'

Freud's gloss on the Book of Genesis is as follows. In the beginning the ancestors of man lived in a primitive horde similar to the contemporary gorilla. One mature male monopolized all the females, expelling the male children as they became sufficiently mature to question his monopoly of females and leadership.

One day the expelled brothers joined forces, slew and ate the father and thus put an end to the father horde. . . . These cannibalistic savages ate their victim . . . [who] had surely been the envied and feared model for each of the brothers. . . . The totem feast, which is perhaps mankind's first celebration, would be the repetition and commemoration of this memorable criminal act with which so many things began, social organization, moral restrictions and religion. . . . Remorse, a sense of guilt was formed which coincided here with the remorse generally felt. The dead now became stronger than the living had been, even as we observe it today in the destinies of men. What the father's presence had formerly prevented they themselves now prohibited in the psychological situation of 'subsequent obedience' which we know so well from psychoanalysis. They undid their deed by declaring that the killing of the father substitute, the totem, was not allowed, and renounced the fruits of their deed by denying themselves the liberated women. Thus they created the two fundamental taboos of totemism out of the sense of guilt of the son, and for this very reason these had to correspond with the two repressed wishes of the Oedipus complex. . . . Society is now based on complicity in the common crime, religion on the sense of guilt and the subsequent remorse, while morality is based partly on the necessities of society and partly on the expiation which this sense of guilt demands. . . . In the Christian doctrine mankind most unreservedly acknowledges the guilty deed of primordial times because it has now found the most complete expiation for this deed in the sacrificial death of the son.

In a final summary of his views Freud reiterates these points:

In closing the study . . . I want to state the conclusion that the beginnings of religion, ethics, society and art meet in the Oedipus

complex. This is in entire accord with the findings of psychoanalysis, namely, that the nucleus of all neuroses as far as our present knowledge of them goes is the Oedipus complex.¹

FREUD'S GENERAL METHODOLOGY

Before discussing the evidence for the deed which allegedly initiated man into his true humanity and simultaneously gave rise to religion, culture and social organization and incidentally established the systems of totemism, tabu and exogamy, it will be fruitful to discuss the necessary assumptions of the psychoanalytic approach to prehistory. The truth or falsity of the detailed conclusions will obviously depend on the validity of the general assumptions of method.

(i) If we attempt to place *Totem and Tabu* in relation to the historical development of anthropology, the aptest description would be that it represents the last of the speculative writings of the 'literary' or 'armchair' school. (This is to ignore the derivative and imitative works of the Freudian and Jungian schools.) It is the culmination, or, more unkindly, the reduction to absurdity of the method of uncontrolled speculation by chairborne students of rite, custom and belief. It is characteristic of this method that the theorist starts with a hypothesis transferred uncritically from some unrelated branch of knowledge—for example, biology, or physics, or psychopathology. Instead of studying the available anthropological data in its actual context, selected material is 'matched' against the theory. Procrustes was the spiritual father of this method.

(ii) In this connexion the main error of Freud consisted in taking the narrow and atypical relations of the monogamic, patriarchal family of the central European Jewish middle-class neurotic of the late nineteenth century as the exemplar of the human family everywhere. According to Freud, polygamous, polyandrous, matriarchal or patriarchal groups all retain the emotions and complexes manifested in the unconscious fantasies of the European neurotic. The infantile attitude to the father is taken as a common datum in all societies. Thus he says: 'The analogy between the savage and the neurotic may allow us to surmise how much in the relation of the savage to his ruler arises from the

¹ *Totem and Tabu*, pp. 218-36.

infantile attitude of the child to the father.' This preconception is a basic presupposition of his whole thesis. But even when his book was being composed it was notorious that familial relations in different communities were not modelled on the Mosaic-Christian family of Western Europe. Totemism itself, the phenomenon which Freud was trying to elucidate, testifies to the existence of a classificatory 'family' in which monogamy may or may not be found. The savage 'dread of incest' to which Freud draws attention is a dread of contravening classificatory relationships (in other words, everybody in the totem group is 'brother' or 'sister'); it has nothing to do with the distinction Freud makes between 'real incest as a special case' of violation of the totem rule. The savage does not make the distinction between social and biological incest. Freud is guilty of the pathetic fallacy when he foists his feelings and views of family relations on to the individual of totemic society.

(iii) If we deny that the content of the savage psyche is the same as the Freudian picture of Western man, this is also to deny that the psychoanalytic method is applicable to the data of pre-history. To say the least, it seems to be questionable procedure to treat social institutions such as totemism, tabu, ritual, belief, etc., as symptoms of a neurosis. Freud's equation of tabu with a compulsion neurosis, of totemism with an animal phobia and of art as hysteria, is an interesting analogy and speculation. It is characteristic of Freud's analytical technique that he substitutes the terms of an analogy in a chain of deductive reasoning quite as though they were the terms of a real equation. Thus what is at best an extremely fertile method of generating hypotheses is taken by him as a method of scientific proof.

(iv) This misuse of analogy arises from the conviction that the criterion of anthropological truth (as of psychoanalytic truth) lies in the plausibility and coherence of the theory, which ultimately takes a narrative form. If a connexion can be established between phenomena by analogy, and the various terms of the analogy can be shown to be related in divers fashion, although the relations continue to be entirely analogical Freud assumes that a real objective connexion has been made out. Thus his interpretations, whether of dreams or neuroses or prehistoric data, always give the impression of being set-pieces, with every rocket and cracker going off simultaneously to the astonishment of all beholders. It is this very characteristic of psychoanalytic hypotheses in the field

of prehistory which must call forth our suspicion. Where so much is dark and obscure, when we know from general considerations that the true relations between cultural phenomena which have been preserved for us by various accidents of history can never be made out except in terms of a very low level of probability, a theory which aspires to relate not only totemism and exogamy to each other but to link these to specialized data of a very different character by means of a method which bears no relation to that of anthropological technique, when in addition we are given an unqualified explanation of social institutions, religion, art, morality and the allegedly universal characteristics of human beings the theory can only be received with scepticism, if not with cynicism. The very comprehensiveness and 'multiple determination' of the theory render it unlikely and implausible.

(v) Freud accepts and uses as the basis of his arguments the conception of a unilinear evolutionary development of man and society. This was a useful principle of method when no other technique was available for linking the materials of prehistory in a time dimension. But the negative aspects of such a theory and method soon became apparent. Anthropologists built up a Frankenstein monster of prehistoric man. Selecting their data from any society which suited the immediate purpose, wrenching a custom or belief from the totality of its social setting, placing incongruous and disparate elements side by side, arbitrarily discarding those which did not march with their preconceived ideas, the evolutionists built up a brilliant patchwork, but one in which the pattern was laid down by the designer rather than by the course of historical development. The criterion of anthropological truth was literary rather than historical; coherence rather than correspondence to objective reality was sought.

(vi) Hand in hand with this dogmatic, unhistorical evolutionism, we find in Freud, as in this school in general, a dependence on 'psychological' explanations. The two principles here are the assumption that whatever is simple and 'brutish' comes necessarily at the beginning of human history, and the assumption that psychological states follow one another in a predetermined order, so that knowing the position of one the succession of the others can be postulated without the need for historical analysis. This succession is given by introspection. The method can be illustrated from *Totem and Tabu* where Freud attempts to establish the 'original' qualities of totemic belief. His procedure here, which is

quite characteristic of this particular evolutionary school, is wholly arbitrary. He says:

If we wish to arrive at the characteristics of the original totemism by sifting through everything that may correspond to later developments or decline we find the following essential facts. The totems were originally only animals and were considered the ancestors of single tribes. The totem was hereditary through the female line only. It was forbidden to kill the totem (or to eat it, which under primitive conditions amounts to the same thing); members of the totem were forbidden to have sexual intercourse with each other.

Without being unfair one can only assume from this demonstration that the test of 'original totemism' is how far the elements of it are in accord with Freud's theory of the origin of this institution. No evidence is produced to show, for example, that plant totems are not original. If they were, the whole Freudian theory of totemism must fall—therefore they are arbitrarily discarded as possible elements of the original totemic system. Similarly, a totemic feast is a necessary element of the Freudian theory of origins. Therefore he presses into service St Nilus' description of a peculiar Semitic ritual centring around the consumption of a raw camel by a single group of nomad Arabs about the year A.D. 500 and takes this as a survival of a once universal custom.

(vii) Another necessary assumption of the Freudian analysis is that of psychic recapitulation. This is the theory that the individual passes through stages of psychic development parallel to those of the human species in its historical development. The original meaning of totemism is supposed to be arrived at by psychoanalysis through traces originally identified in the infantile experiences and desires of the adult neurotic. These traces are allegedly distributed universally (since Freud recognizes no difference in construction between the normal and neurotic psyche). Savage and semi-savage tribes are of interest to the psychoanalyst because we can recognize in their psychic life 'a well-preserved, early stage of our development'. The persistence of morality and religion on this view is based on racial memory. Our essential humanity (which for Freud consists in our manifestation of the universal Oedipus complex) depends on the transmission of memories and psychic processes developing out of the original crime of the horde brothers. He says:

It can hardly have escaped anyone that we base everything upon the assumption of a psyche of the mass in which psychic pro-

cesses occur as in the individual. Moreover we let the sense of guilt for a deed survive for thousands of years, remaining effective in generations which could not have known anything of the deed.

Thus Freud is driven to accept the 'mass psyche' and 'racial memory' because of the pressing need to account for the alleged universality of the Oedipus complex. Although scientists have sought for a century for empirical evidence of these constructs they have sought in vain: ideas of the 'group mind' and of the inheritance of 'general ideas' are completely discredited.

(viii) Underlying all these presuppositions is the general principle that such social constructions as tabu, totemism, exogamy, religion, morality, art, etc., must be explained ultimately in terms of psychology (not to say, psychoanalysis). Quite apart from the consideration that supernatural sanction is claimed for these phenomena (a claim which Freud is nowhere disposed to consider) these institutions have economic, juridical and sociological components which must play some determining rôle. An explanation in terms of causation which *completely ignores* these determinants may be ingenious, but it can command no respect.

FREUD'S SPECIAL ASSUMPTIONS

Consideration of the general method pursued by psychoanalysis in attempting to account for the origin of religion is sufficient to demonstrate the extreme unlikelihood of the Freudian explanation. A mere statement of the special assumptions made in Freud's gloss on Genesis, when we strip these of the clouds of analogy and suggestion with which they are surrounded, serves to reveal the extreme implausibility of this account. There are ten special assumptions, each centrally relevant to Freud's theory.

(i) He accepts a suggestion, thrown out by Darwin in passing, as to the mode of life of the first ancestors of man. 'Arguing from the social habits of man as he now exists', Darwin suggests two possibilities as the prototype of present-day communities. *Either* man lived in small communities each male having a single partner, *or* a single nonsocial male had several wives, living in a horde, similar to the gorilla. Freud accepts the latter speculation, and links this with Atkinson's further speculation that *exogamy* would arise out of this situation, assuming that the mature males are driven out of the horde.

(ii) A second assumption is that an 'animal phobia' in children (a case of which he discussed and analysed in terms of the Oedipus complex) is substantially identical with totemism, coming into the class of a psychic recapitulation from savagery. This is completely to ignore the fact that animal totems constitute only a part of the class of objects which act as totems. Frazer says:

As distinguished from a fetich, a totem is never an isolated individual but always a class of objects, generally a species of animals or of plants, more rarely a class of inanimate natural objects, very rarely a class of artificial objects.

Natural forces, such as the wind, or a part common to many animals, such as the nose, may also constitute a totem group.

(iii) On the analogy of his analysis of Little Hans' horse phobia it is asserted that in the animal phobia in general (and therefore in the totemic system) the animal acts as a substitute for the father. In other words, the fear in animal phobia is fear of the father: the injunction not to kill the totem animal conceals the unconscious wish to murder one's father. Freud's paper on the *Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-year-old Boy* should properly be classified as science fiction. All that need be said of it here is that the 'interpretation' comes entirely from suggestions put to Hans as leading questions and emanating from the boy's father (who seemed to be more in need of treatment than did Little Hans), that the material is painfully twisted to fit the Oedipus situation, that an extremely peculiar relationship existed between the child and his father, and that the mode of upbringing was to say the least peculiar. Similar questionable modes of reasoning to those examined are to be found in this paper on animal phobia.

(iv) The fear and envy of the father allegedly found in animal phobias are elements of the Oedipus complex: fear and envy are generated by the hostility which arises because it is the father who stands in the way of gratification of the child's incestuous wishes. Thus the basis of the universal Oedipus complex is to be found in the 'universal' parent-child situation. But it has its roots also in the racial experiences carried over into the life of the child as inherited reminiscences of the memorable atrocity committed by the horde brothers.

(v) Freud was a child of his times. This is shown nowhere so clearly as in his attitude to women. His theories continually under-value or rather completely ignore the question of the female

contribution to culture and social organization. Nowhere in *Totem and Tabu* does he mention the woman, except as the object of incestuous desires. In his general psychoanalytic theory the various female complexes are obviously an afterthought: the Elektra complex and the rest are tacked on to what was originally a psychology for men only. He does not see the need for constructing a parallel explanation for the allegedly ubiquitous Elektra complex (he later got rid of the difficulty by renaming this—the Oedipus complex!). There is also the fact which is totally overlooked that the female moiety is also divided into totems and is subject to tabus of killing and eating the totem animal or plant and of marrying within the forbidden group.

(vi) Freud ignores the fact that there are a great variety of tabus, some connected with the totem, some not. Only the Oedipus tabus are 'explained': other tabus, whether totemic or otherwise, are left unexplained. We are left with the problem as to how the two commands not to kill the totem nor to marry women belonging to the same totem group spread to include other proscribed acts. How does the complex system of moral restraints and impulsions grow out of the Oedipus situation? How in fact do the totem tabus become Oedipus tabus since in fact the child has no desire to *eat* his father, nor does the neurotic desire commerce with a whole group of ineligible females?

(vii) Freud accepts the view that the totem-feast was from the beginning an integral part of the totemic system. He accepts the theory of Robertson Smith that the totem feast was essentially similar to the *sacrifice* in Semitic religion: this in turn was a prefiguring of the sacrifice of the Crucifixion. Freud follows Robertson Smith in identifying the sacrificial animal of the Semitic ritual with the old totem animal.

(viii) He assumes that there was a similar ambivalent attitude on the part of the primitive savage to the totem animal as in the Semitic ritual towards the scapegoat. The scientific status of these assumptions is highly questionable.

(ix) The concern of Freud in *Totem and Tabu* is to discover the origin of religion and morality. The killing and eating of the totem are taken by him as the central themes of a totemic religion which is allegedly the prototype of *all* religion. It is assumed by him that the attitudes he takes to be typical of all religion are to be found in the first totemic feast and are regenerated in us partly by inheritance and partly by a typical reaction to a universal

situation. These attitudes are alleged to be: immature dependence on a source of authority which is characterized by the ambivalent attitudes of love and fear originally centred on the father; a neurotic retreat from reality shown by the acceptance of an illusion rather than by the desire to grapple with the difficulties of exact science; the gratification in socially permissible forms of our infantile urges, especially our impulse to destroy beloved persons and consume them. Whatever may be true of the religious beliefs of Christians and Jews, it is at least very doubtful if totemism constitutes a religion in this Freudian sense of the word. The complex attitudes of revealed religion are hardly to be found in totemism which is a system of practical injunctions having primarily a social and economic reference.

(x) As his ultimate special assumption Freud integrated these presuppositions into the narrative history of the killing and eating of the hated horde father, the primeval act which ushered in the first really human society. The improbability of this story is to be measured by multiplying the improbability of each of the special assumptions previously outlined.

CONCLUSION

In a double-barrelled attempt to devalue religion and to account for the alleged universality of the Oedipus complex (a theory which he regarded as an essential basis of psychoanalytic theory and practice) Freud concocted a myth about human origins which he attempted to dress up as a scientific account. His treatise *Totem and Tabu* is written with great skill and advocacy, but it remains an interesting relic merely. It demonstrates how a potentially great scientific investigator can be led astray when he deliberately turns his back on the conditions necessary for the establishment or disproof of hypotheses, and decides to rely on intuitive processes and literary skill.

ST EDWARD'S TITLE OF CONFESSOR

By BERNHARD W. SCHOLZ

KING EDWARD THE CONFESSOR, the last of the Anglo-Saxon royal house on the throne, was the third among the English kings to bear the name of Edward. To avoid any uncertainty, his *First Life* (written before 1076) identified him as *Æduardus Rex qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit*. Osbert of Clare, in his *Vita* of Edward (c. 1138), called him *beatus Edwardus rex Anglorum*. The numerous manuscripts of the later lives, on the other hand, usually introduced the king as *Sanctus Edwardus, rex et confessor*.¹ The title *Confessor*, the *Cambridge Medieval History* informs us,² was conferred upon Edward in his bull of canonization, which Pope Alexander III issued in 1161, nearly a century after the death of the saint.³ The question still remains: Why did Edward receive this title which was to become his lasting epithet?

The modern process of beatification and canonization distinguishes two categories of saints: martyrs on the one hand, confessors, virgins, and holy women on the other. Confessor, accordingly, is the title of all male saints who are not martyrs. The terms confessor and martyr (or correctly their Greek equivalents *ὑμώλογος* and *μάρτυρ*) originally had been synonymous, both meaning 'witness' without regard to the way in which testimony had been given. From the second half of the second century on, the name of confessor came to be reserved for saints who had not suffered a martyr's death. Gradually, their 'witnessing' had to consist no longer of bodily sufferings but could be a spiritual martyrdom realized through a pure life and the observation of the commandments. The first saints in the West thus to be called confessors

¹ 'Vita Æduardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit,' in *Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. H. R. Luard, Rolls Series (London, 1858), p. 389; 'La Vie de S. Edouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare,' ed. M. Bloch, *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLI (1923), 64; T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, three vols. in four parts, Rolls Series (London, 1862-71), I, 636-43.

² III, 999.

³ Migne, *PL*, CC, 106-7.

were several bishops of the fourth century who had defended the faith against Arianism and suffered for it: St Sylvester, for example, St Martin, and St Augustine. From these bishops the title was extended to other saints, and when Gregory of Tours wrote about 'the glory of the confessors', he applied it to bishops as well as abbots, monks, virgins, and holy women.¹

Already the so-called *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*,² contains saintly confessors beside martyrs, and confessors appear in the first ('historical') martyrology from English soil, the famous and influential martyrology of Bede.³ The calendar of St Willibrord, written at the beginning of the eighth century, lists apart from a number of martyrs the confessors Felix and Quintus. With an increasing number of entries in later calendars, the confessors became more numerous. Among the early calendars published by F. Wormald, I count twelve confessors in a North Country calendar of the ninth century; twenty appear in a West Country calendar of the tenth century and twenty-three in a Wessex calendar of the eleventh century.⁴ But, throughout the Middle Ages, the notion persisted that the title of confessor was inferior to that of martyr. St Peter Chrysologos, in one of his sermons, felt called upon to defend the merits of the confessor Apollinaris: 'Nec eum quisquam confessoris vocabulo minorem credat esse quam martyrem, quem Dei nutu quotidianum et multiplicem reversum conspiciat ad agonem.'⁵ Similarly, John of Joinville, in the prologue to his *Life of St. Louis*, the saintly king and crusader, complained about the rank assigned to his hero, who had been named a confessor: 'I cannot but think that it was an injustice to him not to include him in the roll of the martyrs, when you consider the great hardships he suffered as a pilgrim and crusader during the six years that I served with him.'⁶

¹ M. Buchberger, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (Freiburg, Breisgau, 1930-8), s.v. 'Bekennen'; R. Naz, *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique* (Paris, 1935-55), s.v. 'Causes de Béatification et de Canonisation'; F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie* (Paris, 1907-53), s.v. 'Confesseur'; G. Pizzardo, *Enciclopedia Cattolica* (Vatican City, 1949-55), s.v. 'Confessore'; E. W. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (London, 1948), pp. 17 ff; B. Botte, 'Confessor', in *Archivum latinum medii aevi. Bulletin Du Cange*, XVI (1941), 137-48, especially, 147.

² *Acta Sanctorum*, November, II, Pt. 2.

³ *Acta Sanctorum*, March, II, 5-42.

⁴ *The Calendar of St. Willibrord from MS. Paris. Lat. 10837*, ed. H. A. Wilson, Henry Bradshaw Society, LV (London, 1918); *English Kalendars before A.D. 1200*, ed. F. Wormald, Henry Bradshaw Society, LXXII (London, 1934), nos. 1-3.

⁵ Migne, *PL*, LII, 553.

⁶ *The Life of St. Louis by John of Joinville*, trans. R. Hague (London and New York: Sheed & Ward, 1955), pp. 23-4, 217; the passage from St Peter Chrysologos is quoted by Botte, p. 147.

When King Edward was canonized in 1161, there was actually no question as to his place in the liturgy of the Church; he had to be ranked as a confessor. Nevertheless, his was somehow a special case. More than twenty saints had been canonized by a pope before Edward the Confessor, though only eleven bulls of canonization concerning this group have survived.¹ All of these pertain to non-martyrs. In the bulls for Ulric of Augsburg, Peter of Anagni, and Abbot Sturm of Fulda (canonized in 993, 1109, and 1139), the popes called the candidates confessors.² Other popes referred to officially canonized saints as confessors outside the bulls of canonization: Leo IX did this when speaking of Simeon of Padolirone,³ and Alexander II, according to a comment in the *Liber Tripartitus*, with reference to Robert, abbot of Chaise-Dieu, whose bull has not survived.⁴ Other saints, of course, were called confessors in the reports of their lives and miracles.⁵ None of the three bulls, however, which named their saints confessors was as distinct as Alexander III was in the bull for St Edward. None of them used the title of confessor in the actual proclamation clause. Innocent II, for example, declared of Abbot Sturm: 'eundem beatum virum inter sanctos et electos honorari praecepimus'.⁶ But of Edward, after naming the saint twice a confessor, Alexander III explicitly proclaimed: 'Unde videlicet inter sanctos confessores de caetero numeretur, qui hoc ipsum apud Deum signis meruit, ac virtutibus obtinere.'⁷ It seems that in our case the bestowal of the title of confessor was more deliberate and carried a special emphasis. This could have been the result of various considerations:

(1) To confer upon St Edward the title of confessor was suggested to the pope by those who requested the canonization. One of the petitioners, namely King Henry II, spoke in his letter to Alexander of the 'merita confessoris'.⁸ He apparently took up

¹ Edward the Confessor was the twenty-fifth saint to be canonized officially by a pope, according to Theodor Klauser, 'Die Liturgie der Heiligsprechung', in *Heilige Überlieferung* (Ildefons Herwegen Presentation Volume), *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens, Supplementband* (Münster, 1938), pp. 229 ff. I have followed, on the whole, the more recent work by Kemp, quoted above, p. 240, n. 1.

² Migne, *PL*, CXXXVII, 845-7; CLXIII, 261; CLXXIX, 450-1.

³ Migne, *PL*, CXLIII, 739.

⁴ *Acta Sanctorum*, April, III, 329.

⁵ St Romuald (Migne, *PL*, CXLIV, 1008), for example, St Hugh of Cluny (Migne, *PL*, CLIX, 919-20), St Gerard of Potenza (*Acta Sanctorum*, October, XIII, 469), St Bernard of Hildesheim (*Acta Sanctorum*, October, XI, 993).

⁶ Migne, *PL*, CLXXIX, 450.

⁷ Migne, *PL*, CC, 107.

⁸ F. Liverani, *Spicilegium Liberianum* (Florence, 1863), p. 631.

a phrase from the earlier correspondence on the canonization of Edward, which, according to the bull of canonization, was re-examined and submitted to the inspection by the pope. When the prior of Westminster, Osbert of Clare, attempted unsuccessfully to have Edward canonized, in or about 1139, he asked Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester and papal legate, for support. In this letter Edward was called confessor for the first time. Osbert implored the legate: 'sanctum domini confessorem et regem Eadwardum, ne patiamini ulterius ut inglorius delitescat'.¹ To Osbert of Clare the concept of confessor had a special connotation. He applied it particularly to the virgin saint. In his *Vita beati Eadwardi regis Anglorum*, of which the legend of Edward's virgin marriage forms an important part, he compared the king with the holy confessor Alexis, whom God 'preserved in virginity'.² The reader of Osbert's letters and writings can find numerous instances of Osbert's interest in the doctrinal and pastoral aspects of virginity. Besides, such an interpretation was not alien to the Church and was also put forward by Egbert of York in the eighth century: 'Sancti Patres, quos Confessores nuncupavimus, id est Episcopi, Presbyteri, qui in castitate servierunt Deo'.³

(2) King Edward was the first saint to be canonized by Alexander III. The former Roland Bandinelli, a master of both canon law and theology, was a contemporary of Gratian and lived thus at a time when canon law was being codified and theology systematized. The idea of placing St Edward distinctly among the confessors may have been the result of a curial policy which intended to classify saints in the bulls of canonization, an attempt, in a way, at systematization in the process of canonization. In two of the four bulls announcing the canonization of Thomas Becket, Alexander was equally specific and proclaimed the assumption of the archbishop not only among the saints but into the 'college of martyrs'.⁴ When the same pope informed the king of France of St Bernard's canonization, he declared: 'eum . . . canonizandum decrevimus, et inter beatissimos Confessores festiva celebritate colendum'.⁵ But it did not become a practice to name the liturgical rank of a saint in the bulls of canonization. Alexander himself in several cases, as well as his successors,

¹ *The Letters of Osbert of Clare*, ed. E. W. Williamson (London, 1929), p. 84.

² 'La Vie de S. Edouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare,' p. 75.

³ Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, s.v. 'confessor'.

⁴ Migne, *PL*, CC, 900.

⁵ Migne, *PL*, CLXXXV, 623.

ST EDWARD'S TITLE OF CONFESSOR 243

Clement III, Celestine III, Innocent III, was again satisfied with a more general formula.

(3) Edward's canonization was the first papal legalization of the cult of an English saint. The question whether the candidate was worthy of the dignity must have been of eminent concern to the pope. Edward's saintly reputation was well established, but there were weak points in his case. Nearly a century had passed since his death; a previous request for his canonization had been rejected; he was, after all, not a member of the clerical order which had filled the catalogue of the saints, but a layman and, in addition, a king, and he lacked the distinction of a martyr's crown which was still the most convincing proof of sanctity, and which could have put him in a line with such popular holy kings of England as St Oswald and St Oswin, St Edmund and St Edward the Martyr. The confessor title could explain the specific nature of the new saint and demonstrate the legitimacy of his claim to his rank.

(4) Finally, Edward's title of confessor must have struck the contemporaries as a very particular distinction and honour. When the Emperor Frederick I proclaimed the canonization of Charlemagne, through the authority of the anti-pope Clement IV, his charter of the canonization (existent only in a spurious privilege to Aix la Chapelle dated 8 January 1166) copied the bull of Alexander III for Edward.¹ The authors of this document were very eager to have Charlemagne considered as a confessor and wrote:

Nunc vero electum et sanctissimum confessorem eum confitemur et veneramur in terris, quem in sancta conversatione vixisse et pura confessione ac vera penitentia ad deum migrasse et inter sanctos confessores sanctum confessorem et verum confessorem credimus coronatum in celis.²

The chancery of Frederick I, where the diploma was produced, had good reason to emphasize the holiness of Charlemagne by insisting on his dignity as a confessor. The canonization was a political manoeuvre, and there was no consensus, to say the least, as to the saintly character of the candidate. But also Edward's canonization had a political background. The request for it had

¹ R. Folz, *Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1950), p. 210.

² See the edition by H. Loersch, in G. Rauschen, *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Publikationen der Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde, VII (1890), p. 155.

the support of the king, and the pope, engulfed in the schism of the Church, obviously complied because he was obliged to Henry who had recognized him, only a few months before, as the rightful head of the Church. Edward could thus easily appear to some as a 'political saint'. This may have induced the pope to qualify and stress the holiness of the candidate by enrolling him in the 'order of the confessors'.

Any of these motives could have been responsible for the emphasis on the confessor title in Edward's bull of canonization. On the other hand, this emphasis alone can only partially account for the fact that the title became Edward's epithet. The desire to distinguish St Edward the Confessor from his holy predecessor Edward the Martyr, as well as later from the Edwards among the Plantagenet kings, must have played an equal part. Among the post-canonization sources concerned with Edward, the confessor title, in conjunction with *rex*, appears consistently in the liturgical sources. Most of the later Benedictine calendars published by F. Wormald, for example, note on 13 October: 'Translatio sancti Eadwardi regis et confessoris'.¹ The manuscript titles of the later lives also call him 'rex et confessor', while in the texts he usually appears as 'rex' or 'sanctus'. The gradual transition of the title from a liturgical rank to an epithet seems to be visible in a number of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century chronicles (Henry Knighton, John Brompton, John Hardyng, *The Brut*), when in historical (not hagiographical) contexts Edward is described not as *Sanctus Edwardus, rex et confessor*, but as *Edwardus confessor, Kyng Edwarde the Confessour*, or *Seynt Edward the Confessoure*.²

Schenectady, New York

¹ *English Benedictine Calendars after A.D. 1100*, ed. F. Wormald, Henry Bradshaw Society, LXXVII, LXXXI (London, 1939-46); see 13 October in the calendars of Abbotsbury (c. 1300), Abingdon (s. XIII), Christ Church, Canterbury (added s. XIII-XIV), St Mary and St Werburgh, Chester (added s. XIII), Croyland (s. XV), Evesham (s. XIV); 13 October and 5 January: Westminster (s. XV) and Malmesbury (1521); 8 January: Ely Cathedral Priory (s. XIII). See also, for example, the *sanctorale* in *The Ordinale and Customary of the Benedictine Nuns of Barking Abbey*, ed. J. B. L. Tolhurst, two vols., Henry Bradshaw Society, XXV-XXVI (London, 1927-8), II, 322 (c. 1400), and calendar (13 October), *sanctorale* (13 October), and *temporale* (5 January) in *The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, ed. J. B. L. Tolhurst, six vols., Henry Bradshaw Society, LXIX, LXX, LXXVI, LXXVIII, LXIX, LXXX (London, 1932-42), V, IV, I (c. 1300).

² *Chronicon Henrici Knighton*, ed. J. R. Lumby, two vols., Rolls Series (London, 1889-95), I, 3, 10; John Brompton, *Chronicon*, in *Scriptores X*, ed. Roger Twyden (London, 1652), pp. 955-6; *The Chronicle of John Hardyng*, ed. Henry Ellis (London, 1812), p. 227; *The Brut or the Chronicles of England, I*, ed. F. W. D. Brie, Early English Text Society, CXXXI (London, 1906), p. 128.

CATHOLICISM AND JACOBITISM

Some Wiltshire Evidence

By J. ANTHONY WILLIAMS

MR RALPH ARNOLD's most interesting book on the third Earl of Derwentwater may perhaps have surprised some readers by the impression which it gives that, as one reviewer put it, 'it was not the Catholics who instigated and led the Jacobite rising, but the High Anglican Tories, who left their followers in the lurch'.¹ Possibly some re-thinking is due on the whole Catholic-Jacobite question; a great mass of material was collected by the Rev. John Kirk (1760-1851) for inclusion in his projected, but never-published, continuation of Dodd's *Church History* and much of this now reposes at Ushaw College and among the archives of His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster (Series B, files 8 to 13; especially—for Jacobitism—files 8 and 12). A little of this material has found its way into print in Chapter VII of Dom Basil Hemphill's *Early Vicars-Apostolic of England* (1954), while fugitive references to Catholics and Jacobitism occur in innumerable works, some of them not directly concerned either with Catholicism or with Jacobitism, and it may be of interest, while we await a full study of the subject, to glance at some of the evidence relating to Jacobitism and its Catholic connexions in a single county, namely Wiltshire.

It would, of course, be idle to pretend that there was any very widespread support for the Stuarts in so Nonconformist a county (and it will be seen from the following pages that what support there was, was given by Anglicans as well as by Catholics); nevertheless it is a little puzzling to find that the recently published fifth volume of the *Victoria County History*, dealing with the political history of Wiltshire, contains no reference whatsoever to Jacobitism. Sir John Webb, a prominent Catholic, who had an estate

¹ W. J. Battersby, reviewing *Northern Lights* (1959) in *The Tablet*, 18 April 1959, p. 373. The work is noticed in *THE DUBLIN REVIEW* for December 1959.

at Odstock, near Salisbury, was, after all, the father-in-law of the unfortunate Earl of Derwentwater and was himself an ardent Jacobite, while Longleat House was a centre of Jacobite conspiracy in 1715 and Marlborough had a long history of pro-Stuart sentiment. These three matters will be mentioned in due course; meanwhile we may note that, following the disclosure of 'Fenwick's Plot' in 1692, a leading Wiltshire Catholic, Lord Stourton, was sent to the Tower¹ and local constables were ordered to compile lists of recusants for submission to the Justices of the Peace.² Odd references to Jacobitism also occur in a couple of standard source-books for the history of Wiltshire; a volume of Hoare's *History of Modern Wilts.*,³ for example, tells us that the Catholic Francis Cottington of Fonthill Gifford, who died in 1728, was created a peer by the Pretender as 'Baron Cottington of Fonthill', while the first volume of the *Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections* (Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1901, pp. 159, 160) contains two references to Jacobitism in Wiltshire. The first relates to the imprisonment in 1689 of an individual who declared that William and Mary were not lawfully King and Queen, while the second concerns an allegation that toasts to James II were drunk at Box in the summer of 1691. Other documentary evidence of opposition to the 'Glorious Revolution' is to be found among the diocesan archives at Salisbury in the form of a presentment by the churchwardens of the parish of Broughton Gifford in 1690, part of which reads:

We present Wm. Gerrish, alehousekeeper, for being a reputed papist and acting for y^e late King James. We present John Gay, Wm. Gay his son, Arthur Ash, senior, Joseph Sims, Wm. Sims, John Sims, senior, Wm. Gerrish, alehousekeeper, for riotously, feloniously & forcibly breaking & entering into y^e parish-church & committing a spoile therein.⁴

This, however, is an isolated case and the political upheaval is scarcely reflected at all in the contemporary churchwardens' reports, which convey the impression that Gerrish's co-religionists were not disposed to invite the implementation of the penal laws

¹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, 1678-1714*, II (1857), pp. 446, 458, 471. For the Plot see Sir C. Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement* (1958 edition), p. 145.

² R. Steele, *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations*, I (1910), no. 4087.

³ *Hundred of Dunworth* (1829), p. 21.

⁴ Ep. Presentments at Visitations, Box 7 ('Varia 1676-93').

by drawing attention to themselves; thus, the churchwardens of St Thomas's parish in Salisbury, presenting three 'reputed papists' in 1689, added mildly, 'Yet we doe not find but that they live very peaceable and quiett under the present Government',¹ while during the next decade the churchwardens of such notorious Catholic 'pockets' as Tisbury, Donhead St Andrew, Odstock, Semley, Sutton Mandeville and Fonthill Gifford are to be found reporting *omnia bene* or 'nothing presentable'.²

Of Jacobitism among members of the Established Church there is comparatively little Wiltshire evidence for the period immediately after the Revolution, though the non-juring rector of Orcheston St George, Dr William Beach, appears to have rendered himself liable to prosecution for a 'seditious and treasonable sermon',³ and in May 1691 there was a disturbance at his church, with swords drawn and blows exchanged.⁴ Half a dozen other Wiltshire incumbents were also deprived as non-jurors⁵ but, of course, refusal to take the oaths did not necessarily connote any active enthusiasm for the exiled dynasty; nevertheless, it may be worth while to note in passing that several pages of a Land-Tax Commissioners' minute book, preserved among the borough records at Salisbury (document Z 224), are devoted to lists of persons to whom the oaths were tendered—a majority taking them, but seven refusing and being fined various sums under section ix of the statute 1 W. & M., sess. 2, cap. II. These refusals occurred between March and November 1696 and the offenders became liable not only to a fine but also, as Catholics or non-jurors, to pay their land-tax at a double rate.⁶

One wonders whether Jacobite sentiments may have prompted the remarkable attack by two or three hundred men upon a party of soldiers in Underditch Hundred in November 1695,⁷ while the

¹ Ep. Presentments at Visitations, Box 8. These officials made an almost identical report in the following year (Sub-Dean of Sarum, Court Papers, Box 2).

² Ep. Presentments at Visitations, Boxes 8 and 10. For further particulars of these recusancy-centres see Brigadier T. B. Trappes-Lomax's chapter on 'Roman Catholicism' in the *Victoria County History: Wiltshire*, III (1956).

³ W. H. Jones, *Salisbury* ('Diocesan Histories' series, 1880), p. 258; see also Hist. MSS. Commission, *Various Collections*, I (1901), p. 159.

⁴ B. H. Cunningham, *Records of the County of Wilts* (Devizes, 1932), pp. 277-8; H.M.C. *Various Collections*, I, p. 160.

⁵ See *Victoria County History: Wiltshire*, III, p. 47, and Jones, loc. cit. There was also, of course, Bishop Ken at Longleat.

⁶ See, however, my article in *THE DUBLIN REVIEW* (Spring, 1959) setting out some evidence as to the erratic incidence of the double levy (and inadvertently dating the Salisbury minute-book 1692).

⁷ Cunningham, op. cit., p. 282.

plot against the King's life early in the following year had Wiltshire repercussions in that the Justices of the Peace were ordered to take note of any 'unusual Meetings . . . Dangerous to the Public Peace'¹ and the Lord Lieutenant was instructed by the Privy Council to seize the horses and arms of all papists and to report any who were absent from their homes.² The Jacobite attempt of 1708 resulted in the issuing of similar instructions in March of that year,³ but a month later the Privy Council were able to ask the various Lords Lieutenant to restore the confiscated horses and weapons 'whereas the said desperate attempt is, by the blessing of God, disappointed'.⁴

The death of Anne and the flight of Bolingbroke were followed by the forfeiture of the latter's Wiltshire property⁵ and in July 1715 the Privy Council wrote to Lords Lieutenant and *Custodes Rotulorum*, mentioning 'advices from abroad that the Pretender is preparing to invade this Kingdome' and ordering the seizure of papists' arms, the tendering of oaths, restriction of movement and the implementation of the penal laws, while two months later the arrest was demanded of all Catholics and non-jurors 'that you suspect to be disaffected towards his Ma'ty and his Government and may probably be aiding for such Insurrection and Invasion'.⁶ In parts of the west country feeling ran high: there had been a Jacobite riot at Bristol in the previous October and both during the 'Fifteen' and for several years afterwards the city continued to witness Jacobite demonstrations;⁷ a rebel arsenal was established at Bath, in Devon and Cornwall preparations were made to receive the Pretender (he was even proclaimed king at St Columb!) and there were disturbances in Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, where Longleat House was the conspirators' headquarters.⁸ In the same county, at Marlborough sessions, 'one John Napper, a clothier of Trowbridge, was convicted of having uttered "villainous words, highly reflecting on His Sacred Majesty King George", and, after being fined, was compelled to make

¹ Ibid., p. 283. For the plot see G. N. Clark, *The Later Stuarts* (1940 edition), p. 178.

² Public Record Office, Privy Council Register (hereafter cited as P.C.2), no. 76, pp. 318, 343-5.

³ P.R.O., P.C. 2/82, pp. 5-7, 14, 20. On the 1708 attempt, see Sir C. Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement* (1958 edition), pp. 163-5.

⁴ P.R.O., P.C. 2/82, pp. 40-3.

⁵ P.R.O., Forfeited Estates Papers, ref. F.E.C. 2/83.

⁶ P.R.O., P.C. 2/85, pp. 252-5 (20 July 1715) and pp. 288-290 (16 September 1715).

⁷ J. Latimer, *Annals of Bristol: Eighteenth Century* (Bristol, 1893), pp. 107, 111-13.

⁸ See Sir C. Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement* (1958 edition), ch. viii, and the same author's *The Four Georges* (1946 edition), pp. 31-8.

public recantation in Trowbridge market-place'.¹ Marlborough itself, though, was not without Jacobite adherents; the historian of that borough tells us how one of the Talbots of Lacock used to gather nearby with his friends 'to carouse and drink the health of "the King over the Water"',² while it is well known that Ralph Allen's interception of Jacobite correspondence while he was employed as a letter-carrier between Marlborough and Bath was what brought him to the notice of General Wade in the latter city and proved the first step on his ascent to that wealth and celebrity of which Prior Park is a lasting memento.

How widespread were Jacobite sympathies in Wiltshire in 1715 we have no means of knowing, but it does not seem that any very vigorous reprisals were taken against such sympathizers; indeed, the Lord Lieutenant of Wiltshire, the Whig Earl of Pembroke, who might have been expected to harbour a grievance against Jacobites in general,³ was nevertheless one of seven Lords Lieutenant whose reports upon anti-Jacobite measures in their counties were considered by the Privy Council to be unsatisfactory,⁴ nor do any Wiltshiremen figure among those reported to the Privy Council as having been arrested in the summer and autumn of 1715 and ordered to be bound over to the next Assizes.⁵

Whatever the general attitude in other parts of the county, Marlborough continued to be a centre of disaffection towards the Hanoverians, with the corporation giving the lead,⁶ and in 1720 reference was made to 'the daily and barefaced practices . . . too evident amongst us . . . such is the behaviour, such are the expressions continually seen and heard almost everywhere towards the King'.⁷ Two years later Laver's Jacobite plot called forth further Privy Council instructions to Lords Lieutenant and *Custodes Rotulorum* for the seizure of papists' weapons and horses,⁸ but the Wiltshire Quarter Sessions rolls contain no evidence of any

¹ Petrie, *The Jacobite Movement*, p. 211.

² J. Waylen, *History of Marlborough* (1854), p. 367.

³ In September 1715 he had suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Jacobite sympathizers in Oxford in the election for the Chancellorship of the University (Petrie, *The Four Georges*, p. 38). For the background to Jacobitism in the South-West, see the same author's paper in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1935), pp. 85-106.

⁴ P.R.O., P.C. 2/85, pp. 305-6 (8 November 1715). Five Lords Lieutenant made satisfactory reports, seven unsatisfactory and the majority (apparently) none at all.

⁵ P.R.O., P.C. 2/85, pp. 327-9, 331, 357, 364-5, 392, 404, 413, 414.

⁶ Waylen, *op. cit.*, p. 362.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 367.

⁸ P.P. C., P.C. 2/87, pp. 580-4 (9 May 1722).

repercussions in this county,¹ though Thomas Smith of Shaw House, near Melksham, recorded in his diary on 22 June 1722 a report (unfounded) that arms enough for five hundred men were stored in the house of his friend Mr Webb of Monkton Farleigh, and added that there were several precautionary encampments of troops in the Chippenham area.² Another Webb, the Catholic baronet Sir John of Odstock, Wilts., was alleged to have arms concealed in his Gloucestershire house at Hatherop. (State Papers, Domestic, Geo. I: P.R.O. ref. S.P. 35/32, no. 106; 25 August 1722.)

The 1722 Plot was fastened on by Walpole as a pretext for imposing a special levy of £100,000 upon Catholics and non-jurors, over and above the burden of the double land-tax; those in Wiltshire were assessed at £1359 6s., but the *Journal of the House of Commons* which records this, discloses also that at that date (8 March 1726) the sum of £206 7s. 4d. was still outstanding. The proportion paid by Wiltshire was, nevertheless, well above the national average, which had reached little more than 60 per cent of the total seven years later, when attempts to collect the arrears were at last abandoned.³ The year 1726 was marked by an outbreak of rioting among the weavers of Wiltshire and an observer in Bath believed at first that these disturbances had Jacobite implications, but later 'changed his mind and reported that the majority of the weavers were dissenters and, so far from having Jacobite sympathies, went about with K.W.G. in their caps, signifying that they were King George's weavers'.⁴

The abortive Jacobite attempt of 1744 led to the usual instructions to Lords Lieutenant as to the confiscation of weapons and horses and the enforcement of the laws against Catholics and non-jurors,⁵ while Prince Charles Edward's landing in the following year gave rise to similar orders.⁶ In and around Wiltshire there was much activity: the mayors of Bristol and Exeter were granted

¹ County Record Office, Trowbridge: Great Rolls for Easter, Trinity and Michaelmas, 1722.

² *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, XI (Devizes, 1869), p. 215.

³ B. Magee, *The English Recusants* (1938), p. 177. The amount collected by 1733 was £62,073. A letter setting out some of the 'insuperable' difficulties in collecting the tax is preserved among the State Papers, Domestic, of George I, P.R.O. ref. S.P. 35/75, no. 39.

⁴ J. de L. Mann, 'Clothiers and Weavers in Wiltshire during the Eighteenth Century', in *Studies in the Industrial Revolution* (Essays presented to T. S. Ashton, ed L.S. Pressnell, 1960), p. 69.

⁵ P.R.O., P.C. 2/98, pp. 192-209.

⁶ P.R.O., P.C. 2/99, pp. 182-95.

warrants for raising troops,¹ the Lord Lieutenant of Dorset was instructed to see that the coast was well guarded,² a meeting was arranged to raise troops in Gloucestershire,³ an appeal reached the Government for reinforcements to defend the western counties and the mayor of Portsmouth was commanded to look out for papists.⁴ Informations were lodged against two persons (a surgeon and a Scotsman) in Bath,⁵ and Bishop York, the Vicar-Apostolic of the Western District, had to flee from that city and go into hiding after a bogus letter had been handed to the mayor, purporting to be an expression of Jacobite gratitude for assistance which Dr York was supposed to have given to their cause.⁶ In Wiltshire itself there are several sidelights on the rebellion; Sir John Webb was implicated in a letter, said to have been picked up on the road between Poole and Lulworth, a copy of which was sent to the Government, and is now in the Public Record Office. Part of the document read: 'It is thought proper to wish you joy of our success in the North & if our Naibours should land westward I hope you are ready to assist wth what you mentioned in our last. But I feare the winds have prevented them.'⁷ The Duke of Newcastle at once ordered Sir John's arrest⁸ but the latter must have departed post-haste for the Continent, for he died at Aix-la-Chapelle later in the same month,⁹ though his son (Sir Thomas, the fourth baronet) was reported by the Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Lieutenant of Dorset, still to be living in Wiltshire but, therefore, 'is not within my jurisdiction'.¹⁰

Meanwhile, on 5 October 1745, a mysterious stranger had been observed in Salisbury by a suspicious visitor from a neighbouring county who wrote:

He appear'd to me to be a Gentleman, well dressed, & I take him to be an Irishman & that he may be some Priest or Spie. . . .

¹ P.R.O., State Papers, Domestic, George II, ref. S.P. 36/70, nos. 114 and 115, and S.P. 36/71, no. 73, respectively.

² P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/70, no. 130.

³ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/71, no. 13.

⁴ Ibid., no. 16 and S.P. 36/78, no. 103, respectively.

⁵ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/73, no. 54, and S.P. 36/76, no. 198, respectively.

⁶ See G. Oliver, *Collections Illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire and Gloucester* (1857), pp. 55-6.

⁷ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/69, no. 121 (30 September 1745). This document is mentioned, but with no reference to its source, by Oliver, *op. cit.*, pp. 48, 49, where Hutchins' *History of Dorset* is cited, suggesting that it was a forgery.

⁸ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/70, no. 19 (2 October 1745).

⁹ J. Kirk, *Biographies of English Catholics, 1700-1800* (1909), p. 245.

¹⁰ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/71, no. 57 (Shaftesbury to Newcastle, 12 October 1745).

When he came here first he lodged at a Publick House wch was kept by a profess'd Roman Catholick, after that he removed to a private house where he boarded for about 2 months & as I am inform'd whilst he was there had a Chest of considerable weight brot to him; about a fortnight ago he removed to another private house to board, where he now is & where I came to the sight of him, as afores'd. He has gone out of Town sometimes for a week together, but where no one can tell, neither does anybody in the Town know either his name or from whence he came. . . .¹

Mildly disturbed though Newcastle may have been by this report, he was doubtless reassured to receive, eight days later, an affirmation of the loyalty of the Bishop, the Dean and Chapter and the clergy of the diocese of Salisbury,² while a further manifestation of Wiltshire patriotism came from the cloth-workers of Bradford-on-Avon, Melksham and Trowbridge, who formed an association to oppose the Pretender;³ and at Keevil, near Devizes, a rough manifesto was fixed to the church door accusing the incumbent of neglecting to preach against popery. The latter, the Rev. Richard Wainhouse, wrote to Newcastle on 25 November 1745, enclosing the offending document and it is now among the State Papers at the Public Record Office (ref. S.P. 36/75, no. 12). It comprises a rough, blotchy drawing of a bull, a dog and a shepherd, with the words: 'By the Pope's Athority. This is to give Notice that the Popes Bull will play his old Dogs over agen to begin about ten a Clock in the morning.' Mr Wainhouse supposes this to mean that he ought to preach against popery, but protests that he has done so. He adds that, in his belief, the culprits are Thomas and George Gilbert—a father and son—described as 'turbulent and cruel men', whose literary style, incidentally, seems to betray an addiction to bull-baiting!

Of all the towns in Wiltshire, perhaps the loyalty of Marlborough was the most doubtful; Waylen remarks that 'there can be no doubt that a spirit of defiance towards the 'powers that be' was carried to a most disgraceful extent by the corporation'⁴ and mentions the custom of celebrating the Pretender's birthday by

¹ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/70, no. 73 (letter dated 5 October 1745 from John Burd of Beckington, near Frome, Somerset). It is tempting to speculate whether the mysterious visitor to Salisbury may not have been identical with an 'illustrious stranger' who 'wore sometimes a black and sometimes a fair wig, and disguised his face with paint', who is known to have visited Bristol at about the same time. (See J. Latimer, *Annals of Bristol, 18th Century*, p. 257.)

² P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/71, no. 75.

³ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/74, no. 72 (23 November 1745).

⁴ *History of Marlborough*, p. 362.

ringing the church bells and publicly drinking his health although, he adds, 'the exact era referred to is doubtful'.¹ Some light is shed upon this by a document among the State Papers which suggests that the latter custom may still have been practised in 1745, for in October of that year an Information was lodged against the Mayor, the Town Clerk and ten others to the effect that 'on the 25th Sept'. last after he' (i.e. the Mayor) 'and the Justices had taken the Oaths of Office and others the Oaths of Allegiance etc. That very evening, in company with the rest of the Burgesses, and their Town Clark, did drink the Pretender's health by the name of, "May our King be a Stuart"'.² It was also reported that three Jacobite spies had visited the town, claiming that 3000 of their party would be there shortly; this emerges from the following letter to Newcastle from one C. Hunt of Marlborough:

I beg leave to acquaint Your Grace that last Night here were 3 Men Spies, who came to this Town and enquired the names of all the Gentlemen's houses about the Town, the number of Horses, Cattle and Sheep, and what cannon was here; the Alarm was presently spread so that the Constables went in search after 'em but to no purpose for they were purposely concealed by one Mr Hyde,³ a noted Roman Catholic in the Town, where they lay all Night and gave out that 3000 of the Pretender's party w'd be here in a day or two for Quarters.

A footnote adds, 'They are supposed to lay secreted about the Town at this time.'⁴ How much truth there was in this report we cannot say; in any case the letter was written on 10 December, four days after 'Black Friday', and we can only speculate what might have happened in Wiltshire if the Young Pretender had advanced southwards from Derby. As it was, nothing more seems to have been heard of any Jacobite activities in this county, nor do the Quarter Sessions rolls reveal any anti-Jacobite proceedings.⁵

An echo of the Jacobite troubles is perhaps to be found in a letter written many years later to the Bishop of Salisbury by the Rev. Robert Clavering, rector of St Peter's, Marlborough. The letter, dated 5 August 1767, is preserved among several bundles of

¹ Ibid.

² P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/72, no. 10 (10 October 1745). The accused later denied the charge S.P. 36/73, no. 20 (8 November 1745).

³ See *Victoria County History: Wiltshire*, III (1956), p. 91.

⁴ P.R.O., S.P. Dom., Geo. II, ref. S.P. 36/76, no. 103 (10 December 1745).

⁵ County Record Office, Trowbridge: Great Rolls for Michaelmas 1745 and for Hilary and Easter 1746.

correspondence connected with the compilation of a list of Catholics in that year and in it Mr Clavering lamented that Catholic services were frequently performed at the house of the Hydes, situated, annoyingly enough, directly opposite his own rectory; and it was, perhaps, with a recollection of this family's implication in the events of 1745 that he deplored 'such an assembly so near me of those who are such bitter enemies of our Happy constitution in Church and State'.¹ By this time, however, these was not much to be feared from the Hydes or their co-religionists for, on the death of the Old Pretender early in 1766, Pope Clement XIII had declined to acknowledge his son as King of England² and the identification of Catholicism with Jacobitism, to which there had long been many exceptions, lost what little validity remained to it. Indeed, it was only a few years later (and four years before the first Catholic Relief Act) that Lord Arundell of Wardour, the principal Catholic nobleman in Wiltshire and the mainstay of the Faith in the county, was to be found rejoicing in his good fortune at living, even then, under 'our Happy constitution'.³ The statute of 1778 was followed by a more far-reaching Relief Act in 1791 and it is in this year, strangely enough, that we discover what is possibly the last Wiltshire link with the Jacobite movement, for in August 1791 Prince Charles Edward's widow, the Countess of Albany, passed through Wiltshire with her lover, the Piedmontese poet, Vittorio Alfieri, 'sleeping a night at the old coaching-inn at Marlborough'.⁴ It is, perhaps, not unfitting that Marlborough, where Jacobitism had once been so prominent, should have had this final contact with two characters who epitomize its twilight and decay.

¹ Diocesan Archives, Salisbury; Returns of Papists, Box 1.

² See P. Hughes, *The Catholic Question, 1688-1829* (1929), p. 140.

³ Jesuit Archives, Farm Street, W.1: Fr Thorpe's Letters (transcripts): 'Your Lordship's observations on the happiness of living under the British Constitution are very just (letter to Henry, 8th Lord Arundell, 13 April 1774). Fr Thorpe was writing from Italy!

⁴ H. M. Vaughan, *The Last Stuart Queen* (1910), p. 172.

THE AUSTIN CANONS

A Ninth Centenary

By DOM PATRICK HAYWARD, C.R.L.

THE Canons Regular of St Augustine, or Austin Canons as we more usually call them in this country—of which the late Abbot Aloysius Smith, who died on 20 August and who was Abbot-General of the Order for six years after the Second World War, was the most distinguished representative in modern England—recently celebrated the ninth centenary of the reform of their Order. That reform amounted to its consolidation as what, in terms of modern canon law, is technically known as a Papal Institute. In the Church's hierarchy of religious Orders and Congregations, canons regular hold the first place by reason of their antiquity and of their close dependence, in primitive times, on the episcopate. Among canons regular, the Augustinian Canons hold the first place, being the sole surviving variant of the genus, such others as the Premonstratensian and Crozier Canons being not so much different species of canons regular as completely new religious Orders. What, then, is the origin of the *Ordo Canonicus*, which comprises all the various Congregations and autonomous abbeys and priories of Austin Canons? This Canonical Order—which has not even the vague juridical unity of the Benedictine Confederation, though it has a titular head corresponding to the Abbot Primate of the Benedictines—is styled *Ordo Sacer et Apostolicus* and claims to be the oldest of all the Church's religious Orders. What is the truth of this contention?

The claims to a high antiquity made by members of the Order at different times have involved the history of its true origins in an obscurity which only the recent labours of historians have succeeded in removing. These exaggerated claims have at times been fantastic, as for example that made on behalf of the Bethlehem Hospital in London (Bedlam). This hospice had been founded in the thirteenth century for canons and brothers of the Order of St Mary of Bethlehem. Some time in the following century the hospice made an appeal for funds to the City of London, and in their petition they claimed to have been founded as an Order of Knights by the Emperor Constantine, as an Order of Hospitalers by St Augustine, and as a contemplative Order by St James the Less. This is an extreme case: but earlier, in the eleventh century, Lethbert of St Ruf, abbot of Avignon, was claiming that 'this our

Order . . . first blossomed forth with Christ and the Apostles in the Primitive Church', and similar claims have been made until quite recently. Less than fifty years ago a French canon regular, Dom Paul Benoît, stated in his *La Vie des Clercs dans les siècles passés* (Paris, 1914), that all the apostles made their profession at the hands of our Lord and were religious in the strict sense of the term. This apostolic form of life, such writers would have us believe, has continued unbroken down to the present day in the Order of the Canons Regular. Until the reform of the Calendar of the Canons Regular, four years ago, it included as canons regular St Anianus, a disciple of St Mark, and St Rufus, one of the seventy-two disciples of the Lord.

It is true that in the remote era when the feasts of such saints as these were first included in the Calendar for canons regular the word *canon* had not the specialized meaning which it came to have later and still has today. Originally a canon was simply a clerk in holy orders who was on the local bishop's official list (or *canon*) of clergy, and who worked in a *parochia*. He thus differed from a monk, who was neither on the bishop's list nor, necessarily, in holy orders, and also from chaplains of one kind and another, as well as from those priests known as *vagantes*, who were not responsible to any bishop. Later the word canon came to mean a cleric attached to a large city church or, *a fortiori*, to a cathedral. Among such canons some lived a 'religious' life in the full sense of the word (i.e. the common life based on three vows and lived according to a definite rule composed for them by the local bishop). Others led a community life which fell short of the full religious life, usually because the possession of private means was not altogether forbidden. Both alike were not infrequently spoken of as canons regular. It was only after the reform initiated by Pope Gregory VII in the eleventh century that a clear distinction was made between regular and secular canons. Erasmus, himself a sometime canon regular, in his *Pilgrimage to Walsingham*, defines the canon regular as 'a middle kind of creature between the monks and those styled secular canons: an amphibious sort of animal, like the beaver'.

The Order of canons regular has no founder, in any proper sense of the word: a peculiarity shared among the other religious Orders only by the Carmelites, who also have a kind of 'pre-history'. The Canonical Order is an outcome of the living organism of the Church, newly emerged from the primitive era of persecutions. It was only natural that many of the clergy, as soon as conditions made it possible for them to do so, should endeavour to put into practice the ideal of the first Christians, as it is adumbrated in the Acts of the Apostles: 'All the faithful held together, and shared all they had, selling their possessions and their means of livelihood, so as to distribute to all, as each had need' (ii, 4-45). After the peace of Constantine religious houses of lay men and women (monks and nuns) dedicated to the common life

rapidly sprung up in all parts of the empire; but whether or no the parochial clergy should live according to this apostolic pattern depended chiefly on the zeal of individual bishops.

In the fourth century a number of bishops made efforts to combine for their clergy the two elements of the clerical state and the common, or monastic, life. These bishops can be said to have set in motion the process out of which eventually was evolved the canonical Order. According to St Ambrose,¹ St Eusebius of Vercelli was the first in the West to introduce the religious and common life for his clergy. Soon afterwards St Zeno of Verona made a similar attempt. But for all practical purposes it may be said that it was St Augustine of Hippo who was the great pioneer and exemplar of this way of life for the clergy. In Newman's words, he

formed a religious and clerical community which consisted chiefly of presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons who gave up their personal property and were supported upon a common fund. He himself strictly conformed to the rule he imposed on others. Far from appropriating to any private purpose any portion of his ecclesiastical income he placed the whole charge of it in the hands of the clergy, who took by turns the yearly management of it, he being the auditor of their accounts.²

It has sometimes been maintained that the life lived by these bishops with the clerks of their household was more akin to the life followed by such modern communities of secular priests as the Oratorians or the Oblates of St Charles than to that of religious. The late Egerton Beck, for example, held that it did not much differ from the pattern of life which Cardinal Vaughan originally proposed to follow with the clergy of his new cathedral at Westminster. This implies, of course, that there was no renunciation of private property. But Beck seems to have overlooked St Augustine's own description of his life with his episcopal *familia*:

We live in the house which is called the *domus episcopi* and in so far as we can we imitate those holy people about whom the Acts of the Apostles speak: No one called anything his own but everything was common to all. This is how we live: to none in our society is it lawful to possess anything as his own. If anyone does possess something he does that which is unlawful. Whoever departs from the common life once he has adopted it falls from his vow and from his holy religious profession.³

It is true that, three centuries after St Augustine, St Chrodegang of Metz wrote his famous Rule in which he made certain concessions to

¹ Migne, *P.L.* 16, Ep. 63.

² *Church of the Fathers*.

³ Migne, *P.L.* 38, s. 355, 1568.

his canons in the matter of private property, and that in the year 816 the Synod of Aachen was similarly indulgent; but this was during a period of decadence, and represents a serious lapse from the original canonical ideal. From the spreading of the canonical institute in Gaul, after the vandal invasion had made its continued existence in Africa impossible, right up to the Merovingian period, the full common life was practised in many communities of clerics. At the end of the fifth century Julius Pomerius, in his work *De Vita Contemplativa*, teaches the full Augustinian principles of the common life.¹ In the same work he strongly reproaches those canons who cling to certain private possessions. Julius Pomerius was abbot of a community of canons in Arles, but the total renunciation of property which he teaches was not something particular to his own house, but was something practised by canons all over Gaul.

However, the wide adoption of the Rule of St Chrodegang in the eighth century, and of the *Institutio Canoniorum* of the synod of Aachen in the ninth and tenth centuries, compels us to agree with Professor Dickinson² that the main characteristic of the regular canons, namely the union of clerical status and the full common life, was barely existing in the West on the eve of the Gregorian Reform. This widespread acceptance of private property by clerics who were professedly religious was the chief target for Hildebrand's fulminations at the Lateran Council or Synod of 1059, and precisely because it was contrary to the primitive observance of the Order, in which all things were held in common. We cannot blame the canons for this decadence, for the synod of Aachen of 816-17 obliged all the collegiate establishments of the Frankish Empire to adopt the *Institutio Canoniorum* which had been drawn up by Amalarius of Metz. Moreover, Louis the Pious, 814-40, ordered all his bishops to introduce the *Institutio*, and he sent representatives to ensure its maintenance. Many chapters in Italy also adopted it. However, the ideal of the full common life was not wholly lost to sight. An ordinance of Chrodegang explicitly states that those who wish to live the full common life are to be allowed to do so. The synod of Aachen states that the common life is 'fully carried out in many places'.

Nothing is more evident from the proceedings of the Lateran Council of 1059 than the fact that it was the reform of an already existing religious institute that was in question, and not, as Egerton Beck and others have tried to show, the founding of a new Order. That the Rule of St Chrodegang and the *Institutio Canoniorum* were not wholly rejected by the synod, which condemned only those canonical chapters which allowed private property, proves that the synod had no thought

¹ Migne, P.L. 59, 415-520.

² *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London, S.P.C.K., 1950).

of founding a new Order. It merely obliged the canons to live according to that apostolic manner of life which had been restored by St Augustine.

To some Italian houses the Gregorian Reform made no essential difference, for they had in the previous decade undertaken their own reform, under the inspiration of the monastic reform of Cluny. Lucca and Atino are good examples of such houses, which anticipated the Lateran decrees.

Granted that the religious institute of canons regular was merely reformed by the Synod of the Lateran, can it be termed an Order prior to this reform? Abbot Cuthbert Butler, in his *Benedictine Monachism*, defines an Order as 'an organized corporate body, composed of several houses, diffused through various lands, with centralized government and methods of its own, which is in the Church an *imperium in imperio*'. If we accept this definition as the only valid definition of a religious Order, then certainly the canons regular prior to the Gregorian Reform can hardly be called such. But then we shall have to hold that no religious Order existed in the first millenium of the Church's history. For one thing, during all that period centralized government of the kind we now associate with the idea of a religious Order was totally unknown.

But it is unhistorical to apply the hard and dry concepts of modern canon law to those remote times. We must bear in mind, too, that the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience were made expressly and publicly by all religious only from the time of the origins of the mendicant friars (in the thirteenth century). The formulation, too, of an organized canon law defining and regulating every aspect of Church organization dates roughly from the latter half of the eleventh century. Before this an 'Order' was thought of as a way of life which involved the renunciation of private property in favour of holding of goods in common and the practice, in a more or less definite way, of the evangelical counsels. In the three centuries following the death of St Augustine many cathedral chapters and groups of parochial clergy followed this way of life, and so are identifiable as religious canons. But those canons who later followed the Rule of St Chrodegang were certainly not canons regular in the proper sense, as they did not possess the main characteristic of true canons regular, namely, the full and perfect common life. And for this reason they cannot be said to have belonged to an Order, even in the earlier and looser sense of that word.

The papal intervention through the Lateran synod of 1059, which aimed at the reform of all these various houses of (more or less) regular canons, certainly marks the origin of a clearly recognizable Order of Augustinian Canons, which from then onwards was co-terminous with the Canonical Order as such—later canonical bodies (Norbertines, Dominicans, etc., being easily identifiable as distinct religious Orders in the later and more precise sense of the word; the Dominicans, of

course, were soon transformed into mendicants, but they still retained distinct canonical features). Gregory VII, by his reform, gave the canons regular conciliar and papal approbation; his efforts were later reinforced by Urban II, whose interventions resulted in the final triumph of the so-called Rule of St Augustine as the fundamental charter of all regular canons.

The effect of Hildebrand's reform was certainly to transform the Order from its inchoate state and to re-establish it on a solid basis, as well as to recall it to the pure spirit of its origins, as it had been conceived by St Augustine and his disciples at Hippo. But contemporary canons regular are agreed with their mediaeval predecessors in holding that those canons who lived a religious life between the Edict of Milan and the Gregorian Reform are indeed spiritually their ancestors though perhaps collateral ones. Among eminent English Austin Canons were Nicholas Breakspear, who was a canon regular of St Ruf (near Avignon) and who became Pope Adrian IV, St John of Bridlington, George Ripley the alchemist, and the Venerable Walter Hilton, author of *The Scale of Perfection*. St Thomas of Canterbury was closely associated with the Order, to which he owed his education at Merton Priory: but the Icelandic *Thomas Sage Erkebyskups St Thomas Becket* is probably inexact when it says that he made his profession in the Order. He seems to have received the habit (i.e. the canonical rochet), and Professor Dickinson thinks that he was thus invested as some kind of honorary *confrater*. He was certainly greatly attached to the Order, as he was to the prior of Merton, Robert, who became his chaplain and confessor when he was archbishop.

Three other members of the Order also became archbishops of Canterbury: William of Cordeil in the twelfth century, Hubert Walter in the thirteenth century, and Herbert Dean in the sixteenth century. Philip Repingdon, Bishop of Lincoln and chancellor of Oxford University, later Cardinal, was also a canon regular. At the time of the dissolution of the monasteries the Order had something approaching 200 houses in this country, including one cathedral foundation, at Carlisle. The great abbeys of Waltham and Cirencester were Augustinian, and the famous priory of Walsingham was one of the Order's proudest possessions. The London hospitals of St Bartholomew and St Thomas are instances of the Order's charitable works.

The Order, like all others, suffered great damage at the time of the Reformation, and even more in the era following on the French Revolution. So far there has been no great revival to compare with the recovery of Benedictine Order from the ruins in which it lay a hundred or so years ago. However, the canonical ideal and the way of life in which it issues remain today as fresh and attractive as in the days of St Augustine, and in some ways it is singularly relevant as a possible solution to modern pastoral problems.

Today the Order consists of the Congregation of the most Holy Saviour of the Lateran, the independent Congregation of Austrian Canons Regular of the Lateran, the abbey *nullius* of St Maurice-en-Valais (founded 1140), and the *prevoté* of the Great St Bernard (dating from 1215). The two latter canonries, both in Switzerland, have in recent years established foreign missions in North India, on the borders of Tibet and in Sikkim respectively. The Canons Regular of the Lateran have a mission in the formerly Belgian Congo. Other activities of modern canons regular, in addition to their special charge, the choral celebration of the Liturgy, are the cure of souls and education. The great Austrian abbeys of Sankt Florian, Reichenberg and Klosterneuburg are responsible for the administration of a large number of dependent parishes, in the ancient tradition of the canons regular. The last-mentioned abbey is the centre of the modern liturgical movement in Austria which was set in motion by the late Dom Pius Parsch, who was a canon of the abbey.

The Congregation of the Canons Regular of the Lateran is so constituted as to conform to the definition of a religious Order in the later and stricter sense of the term, as defined by Abbot Butler. This Congregation, which is heir to the traditions and privileges of the now extinct Windesheim Congregation, to which belonged the Venerable Thomas à Kempis, was for many centuries a purely Italian body, having its origins from the clergy of the Lateran Basilica in Rome. In later times other Italian groups of regular canons were confederated with the Lateran Congregation, under the government of an Abbot General. Within the last century the Lateran Congregation has made foundations in Poland, Spain, Holland, Belgium, France, South America and England.

In England today the Canonical Order is represented by the Canons Regular of the Lateran whose principle houses are Bodmin Abbey, on which are dependent numerous Cornish mission churches and Mass centres, and St Saviour's Priory at Eltham, in south-east London. The Canons have been handicapped in their development through their self-sacrifice in responding to the requests of bishops to take over the care of small missions and parishes instead of first establishing an abbey of traditional size and dignity where the canonical life could be lived in its fullness. The building of the new abbey church at Bodmin is a first step to restoring the balance.

MAURICE BARING, NOVELIST

A Reappraisal

By DAVID LODGE

THE novels of Maurice Baring, which in his own lifetime enjoyed a small but discriminating readership, seem now to have passed into total eclipse. At first glance this does not seem surprising. The superficial impression given by his work is that of a Marxist parody of decadent capitalist literature. It cannot be denied that Baring created a 'world', but the question presents itself: is this world, or Baring's treatment of it, significant? His world is narrow and exclusive, inhabited only by the aristocracy and landed gentry; those not belonging to these classes exist merely to open the front door and bring in the tea. His characters are educated at Eton and Oxbridge, or by foreign governesses, 'come out', oscillate between town and country houses, go to Scotland for the shooting, 'hop over' to Paris for Easter, take cures at European spas, speak three or four foreign languages, go to 'the' play, go to parties, parties, parties, fall quickly in love, are prevented from marrying, are appointed to government posts and never do any work, marry and sleep in separate bedrooms, have lovers, are jilted and go big-game shooting.

This in itself, of course, is not enough to condemn Baring. The 'worlds' of several great novelists—Henry James and Proust for example—are just as narrow and exclusive. But the novels of Maurice Baring are less immediately recognizable as literature than the novels of James or Proust. The level, polished surfaces of Baring's novels seem to elude the critic's grasp; his style is spare and functional; there is nothing of Proust's rich sensuous appeal, no 'thrills of recognition'; there is nothing of James' artful syntax, suggestive imagery, architectonic skill. There is little variation of tempo, little humour. Baring excluded so much from his novels that we doubt, for a moment, whether he included anything at all. But on closer examination we perceive that he is, after all, a novelist worthy of serious critical attention: a novelist of artistic and philosophical integrity, working carefully within the limits of his experience and ability, master of a style which, if somewhat dry and unexciting, is perfectly suited to his needs, and

possessed of a personal vision which reveals in the narrow and exclusive society he studies patterns of universal significance.

Baring was born in 1874. He was converted to Catholicism in 1909. He began his series of novels in 1921. These dates are significant. Baring began writing novels at a fairly late stage of his career, and drew mainly on his experience of the late Victorian and Edwardian periods. His work is thus marked by an attitude of retrospection, in which his complex emotional response to his own social *milieu*—nostalgia, pity, admiration, melancholy and a qualified pessimism—is ordered and defined.

Equally important is the gap between his adoption of the Catholic faith and the commencement of his work as a novelist, which allowed him satisfactorily to absorb Catholicism into his philosophy of life. Before his reception into the Catholic Church, Baring's mind had been formed by his deep love for and considerable knowledge of classical literature. The peculiar, haunting quality of Baring's vision of life, as revealed in his novels, is its fusion of the pagan and the Christian: the amelioration of the pagan conception of tragedy—stoical acceptance of the workings of Nemesis—by the Christian mystery of forgiveness.

This fusion of pagan and Christian pervades all Baring's work, but it is perhaps most explicit in *Daphne Adeane* (1926). The heroine, Fanny, is faced with an agonizing dilemma: while her husband, Michael, whom she has ceased to love, is at war, she falls in love with another man, Francis Greene. Her husband is reported missing, and, after several years, is presumed dead. Fanny and Francis are planning to marry, when a message arrives stating that Michael has reappeared after suffering from loss of memory. Fanny is faced with the alternatives of asking for a divorce or resuming married life with a man whom she no longer loves. In her distraction she seeks the advice of a priest, Fr Rendall, though she is herself not a Catholic or a Christian. Inevitably, he advises her to give up Francis. She says she cannot, because, as a 'pagan', she cannot accept his premisses. He replies:

'Very well, granted you are a pagan. . . . Now, nobody, as you know, believed more firmly than the Pagans did in the certainty of retribution. You got the retribution whether the sin you committed was deliberate or accidental. Oedipus, through no fault of his own, suffered a terrible chastisement. They believed in expiation. What they were without is the mystery of Forgiveness. . . . If any great and virtuous pagan were alive today, judging your case according to his lights, I do not think he would hesitate to tell you that if you do what you say you intend to do you would be preparing for yourself, and for all those connected with you—your husband, your lover, your children—a Nemesis. A purgatory on this earth.'

A little later in their conversation Fr Rendall says:

'You say you are a pagan. What is, in your opinion, the fundamental idea of Paganism? What is the essence of Greek tragedy?'

'Sacrifice,' said Fanny, without hesitation.

'There,' said Fr Rendall; 'now believe me that in every act of sacrifice we make there is a *balm*, and in every act of self that we make there is an after-taste of fire, smoke, dust and ash.'

Fanny ultimately accepts Fr Rendall's advice, and begins life again with Michael. Baring manipulates the connotations of 'pagan' and 'sacrifice' in a way which, if he were writing a study in comparative religion, would be suspect. But the imaginative artist may legitimately employ such methods to define his interpretation of life.

The idea developed in the passage just quoted is of crucial importance to the understanding of Baring's work. In most of the novels, as in *Daphne Adeane*, it is expressed in terms of a conflict between human and divine love. Louis Chaigne remarked perceptively of Baring's first novel, *Passing By* (1921):

Nous y trouvons déjà le leit motiv que presque chaque roman suivant répètera: en face du dynamisme redoutable de l'amour, cet autre dynamisme, le seul qui puisse lui être efficacement opposé, de la grace surnaturelle, révélation d'un autre amour.

Baring's integrity as a novelist would not allow him to suggest that divine love is always triumphant. One of his best novels, *C.* (1924), was aptly described by a contemporary reviewer as 'a study in the temperament of failure'. It is concerned with the hero's experience of 'pain, unmixed pain, infinite bitterness, and a tragic realization of the pity and waste of things'—the result of his infatuation with a corrupt and worthless woman, Leila Bucknell. In *C.*, as so often in Henry James' novels, evil is manifested by betrayal in human relationships. The scene in which *C.* observes Leila dining with another man in a Parisian café has the same force as that in *The Ambassadors*, where Strether sees Chad and Mme de Vionnet on the river. Baring carefully prepares the scene in order to wring from it the fullest irony. Leila and *C.* have just concluded an idyllic holiday together in France, at the end of which *C.* is at last convinced that she has pledged her love exclusively to him. On his departure for England she bids him a tearful and tender farewell. *C.* is unexpectedly delayed in Paris, and is invited by a friend to make up a party of four. That evening, dining in an open-air café, he sees Leila in high spirits, dining with a man who, his friends assure him, is notorious as her latest lover. To complete the irony, it is to this man that Beatrice is unhappily married—Beatrice, whom *C.* had loved in his youth, until his mother selfishly prevented their intended marriage. *C.* tries to join in the gaiety of his friends, but:

He himself was somewhere else; perhaps he was dead. Perhaps this was the next world. Perhaps it was Hell. That was what Hell would be like, he had so often thought. It would be a place with an appearance, a false air of gaiety about it, and plenty of champagne, and small tables.

Leila also sees C., and, characteristically, accuses him of infidelity first. When she offers her own transparently false excuses, C. gratefully accepts them, because, as he later realizes, he would rather be deceived than ignored:

'I don't want to be cured. I don't want the thorn taken out. I don't want to be released. Oh, Leila, deceive me, deceive me once again!'

C. is Baring's most exhaustive and pessimistic study of human passion. Although Leila's shallowness, vulgarity and corruption is patent, even to C. himself, and although Beatrice, after the death of her husband, offers C. a second chance of peace and pure love, and the recovery of his lost innocence, he cannot cut himself free from his infatuation. In Baring's vision, love, even the most soiled and selfish love, has a fatal and inexorable power against which there is only one resource: '*la grace surnaturelle, révélation d'un autre amour*'. C. lacked this resource—hence his failure. But Blanche, the heroine of *Cat's Cradle* (1925), discovers it just when her life seems, like C.'s, to have been desolated by her own selfish and undisciplined passions.

Cat's Cradle seems to me to be at once the finest and the most typical of Baring's books. In this novel the characteristic features of his vision of life—the attitude of detached yet concerned retrospection, the fusion of pagan and Christian schemes of retribution and forgiveness, and the conflict between human and divine love—are combined in a skilfully executed work of impressive proportions.

Baring carefully explained the moral of *Cat's Cradle* in the Dedication (to Hilaire Belloc), quoting Cervantes:

'Love is too strong to be overcome by anything except flight, no mortal creature ought to be so presumptuous as to stand the encounter, since there is need of something more than human, and indeed a heavenly force, to confront and vanquish that human passion.'

If one stakes all one's hopes of happiness on human love alone, Baring seems to say, one is at the mercy of one's own mistakes. Most of Baring's characters make early in life a fatal mistake which pursues them like a Nemesis all through their lives. Blanche is no exception. At an early age she falls in love with Sidney Hope, a young soldier without prospects. She accepts the well-intentioned but misguided advice of

her father, breaks off her engagement to Sidney, and marries an Anglo-Italian prince, Guido Roccapalumba, whom she does not love. At the end of her life she reflects:

The mistake was in marrying Guido. I knew it was wrong at the time and I did it; everything else proceeded from that, nothing wiped out that first blunder.

It does not take Blanche long to realize that she has married a jealous neurotic. Yet she cannot escape from him, because divorce is taboo in her social circle, and, more importantly, because she becomes a Catholic. A few years after her marriage, Blanche is tormented by the spectacle of Sidney Hope's unexpected inheritance of a rich estate, and she perceives the pattern of Nemesis that is to dominate her life:

... oh, my God, surely I am being punished, and my punishment goes on day after day, and I see no chance of its *ever* coming to an end.

Later, goaded by the misery of her married life, Blanche plans to run away with a Prince Chiaramonte, but Guido, acting, it is suggested, under some suspicion of the circumstances, falls ill of a mysterious disease which confines him to his couch. After nursing him patiently for some years, Blanche falls in love with Bernard Lacey, a scion of the old English Catholic gentry. In a splendidly mounted scene, Guido, walking for the first time in years, enters a room where Blanche and Bernard are engaged in tender conversation:

He looked at them without surprise, put the lamp on the table, and said:

'I thought you would like a lamp, so I brought one. I am sorry that I should appear to be inhospitable to Mr Lacey. I can promise him that this will never happen again.'

Guido arranges a separation, and Blanche occupies herself with the upbringing of her niece and ward, the cold and jealous Rose Mary. Guido dies, and Blanche, still beautiful despite her years, looks hopefully towards Bernard. He visits her and says he is thinking of getting married; she is overjoyed until she realizes that he is referring to Rose Mary. Nevertheless she deliberately misunderstands him, and compromises him into proposing to her. Rose Mary understands the situation, and hates Blanche for her duplicity. From his God's-eye vantage-point Baring notes that Rose Mary does not even give Blanche credit for her moment of genuine misunderstanding: he delights in these fine distinctions. Of course Blanche is no happier than before, as Bernard falls more deeply in love with Rose Mary, who herself makes a loveless

marriage with Bernard's friend Walter. Bernard, refusing to be honest with himself, makes the situation more acute by arranging for Rose Mary and Walter to live in the Dower House on his estate. A malicious woman gives Blanche irrefutable evidence that Bernard is in love with Rose Mary—a revelation that is no less crushing because of Blanche's existing suspicions. The moral history of Blanche reaches its climax; she understands and accepts the pattern of retribution running through her life:

This was her punishment. . . . Did she deserve all this punishment? She had surely been punished already . . . yes, but then she had always done wrong, always gone on doing wrong. Punishment was not meted out to mortals as by an irritable governess or a tyrannical schoolmaster; you were not sent to Hell as a child is put in the corner, or sent into a dark cupboard, arbitrarily, because you are getting on the nerves of a grown-up person, because you have been inattentive, or idle, or stupid—no, punishment is the logical result and consequence of ill-doing. . . .

The Nemesis is in your acts. Every sin avenges itself, carries its vengeance with it, just as a seed carries its fruit. You are made over to retribution, because all ill-doing necessarily bears its fruit, and its fruit is pain, retribution, compensation, punishment, whatever you like to call it. And even those who said there was no such thing as sin, or that sin is no different from measles or neuralgia, or those others who confidently looked on remorse not only as a weakness but as positive evil, a crime rather than a medicine. They, too, had to submit. They could not avoid their retribution, although they might call it by some other name.

This is a crucial passage, with its characteristic mingling of the pagan and the Christian. The scheme of crime and punishment expounded here is pagan in that retribution is seen to follow *in this life*; but Christian in that the adjustment of punishment to crime is ordered with strict justice, and not at the whim of a blind and malicious 'President of the Immortals'. (I use the terms 'pagan' and 'Christian', of course, in the sense in which Baring understood them.) The efficacy of the Christian scheme becomes explicit a little further on, when Blanche at last escapes from her Nemesis by an interior act of sacrifice:

She prayed to be saved from herself for what remained of her life, not to do more harm, not to cause further unhappiness. . . . And it was then the wound caused by the whole situation seemed to pierce her soul, and, as it pierced it, healed it. . . .

Blanche felt at that moment that she would for the rest of her life be able to sacrifice herself. She made the supreme act of self-sacrifice; she knew now that from henceforth she would never grudge Bernard his love for another; she would be able to live without

help, without friends, without love. . . . And from the act of inner self-sacrifice and renunciation she made, came balm; just as hitherto, from every act of self-indulgence she had ever made, had come a sense of scorching ashes.

This conception of sacrifice and renunciation closely resembles the solution offered to Fanny by Fr Rendall in *Daphne Adeane*, even to verbal echoes—'balm' and 'ashes'.

There is no 'objective correlative' to this metamorphosis in Blanche's character: she dies shortly afterwards, to outside observers a lonely and disappointed woman. But to have provided an objective correlative in the form of some dramatic change of heart in Bernard or Rose Mary would have compromised Baring's honest and generally pessimistic judgement of human nature. If the supreme act of self-sacrifice, and death, have released Blanche from the whirligig of human passion, the other characters are still trapped on it. Bernard marries Rose Mary after Walter's death, and it seems that this pair at least have achieved happiness. But in the last pages of the novel the shadow of the war encroaches on their marriage, and with it the slighter but more sinister shadow of a woman. Two people are chattering at a party:

'Is Bernard here tonight? I haven't seen him.'

'He's at a table right over there, having supper with his back to us.'

'I can't see who that is with him.'

'It's Mrs Bucknell.'

'Leila?'

'Yes.'

'Is she just as pretty as ever?'

'Just.'

'She has never been a friend of Bernard's, has she?'

'No, not yet, that I know of.'

This superficially unremarkable passage is an excellent example of Baring's unobtrusive skill as a novelist. The dialogue is effortlessly natural, yet packed with significant undertones and ironies, conveying a judgement on the speakers themselves (and by implication on the social group they represent), as well as suggesting the commencement of another selfish and sterile intrigue. To appreciate the full force of the loaded phrase 'not yet', we must, of course, have read *C*.

Both *C*. and *Cat's Cradle* belong to the genre of the 'life novel'. Both possess the most palpable characteristic of this form—length: each novel runs to more than seven hundred pages. In this respect they stand apart from the rest of Baring's novels. But the great length of *C*. and *Cat's*

Cradle can be justified. Length, as Charles du Bos has said with reference to Baring's work, is a '*nécessité primordiale du roman, qui se propose de nous mettre en possession d'un monde*'. The evocation of a 'world' in historical perspective—aristocratic Europe from 1870 to 1914, is particularly important in *Cat's Cradle*. Nearly all Baring's novels are distinguished by a sense of period, by a mood of retrospection, but seldom is this effect obtained with such an elaboration of detail as in *Cat's Cradle*. It would occupy too much space to illustrate this extensively, but an anecdote recorded by Ronald Knox is indicative of Baring's care over detail:

I remember his spending a whole morning poking about among the strange assortment of books in the old library at Beaufort (now ashes); his object was to discover whether the railway got as far as Rome, or still stopped at Turin, at the time when Blanche first visited Rome in *Cat's Cradle*.

Another significant departure in *C.* and *Cat's Cradle* from Baring's previous practice was the abandonment of experiments with the 'point of view' for a more traditional narrative method. *C.* is presented as a fictionalized memoir based on private papers; though it is written mainly from C.'s point of view, Baring frequently assumes omniscience in order to give extension to the web in which his hero becomes trapped. In *Cat's Cradle*, though the narrative is mainly concerned with the life of Blanche, the God's-eye view is all-pervasive, tracing the ironic and disastrous pattern of events from above.

On the whole Baring seems happier with the more traditional method. Although the use of the point of view in *Passing By* is entirely successful, it degenerates into an academic exercise in the two novels that follow, *Overlooked* and *A Triangle*; while all the novels that follow *Daphne Adeane* are marred by a deliberate arbitrariness and artificiality of design. If one hesitates to endorse André Maurois' description of Baring as '*un grand romancier*', it is because only four of his books are free from serious shortcomings of this kind: *Passing By*, *C.*, *Cat's Cradle* and *Daphne Adeane*. And even these novels are impaired by an excessive reticence about certain areas of experience. Baring's principal theme was the rivalry of human and divine love; he insisted that only supernatural grace could fortify the soul against the assaults of human passion. One feels that this conflict—which Baring presented with such order and logic—would have been more intense and dramatic if the human passion had been more immediately recognizable as a product of man's sensual nature.

When these reservations have been made, however, it seems to me that Baring remains a writer who deserves and rewards serious consideration. The fact that his work lies outside the most interesting

trends and developments in English fiction of the twentieth century perhaps explains why he has been more fully appreciated in France than in his own country. But the value of Baring's novels lies in their content rather than in their form, in the patterns he perceived and revealed in the chaotic flux of experience. The significance of his achievement in this respect has not always been acknowledged.

LE DIALOGUE DES CARMÉLITES

An Appreciation of the Film

This film, made by Père Bruckberger and Philippe Agostini, has received the Grand Prix for 1960 of the Office Catholique Internationale du Cinéma. The appreciation which follows has been translated from the French by a Benedictine of Stanbrook, who writes:

'Georges Bernanos has added the fame of his name to that of Gertrud von le Fort in bringing these martyrs to life and light again out of the obscurity in which they chose to live and the near-oblivion into which their heroic deaths had fallen. This he has done for the world at large on stage and screen, not only for the Church whose altars they adorn. What relationship is there between the story as Bernanos has given it and the recorded facts of history? The historical account is as exciting and dramatic as any playwright could wish. Bernanos's characters and the story in which they are entangled are inventions of his own. The heroine, Blanche, never existed; the incident of the death-bed scene with its presage of Blanche's ultimate victory over herself, never happened; her spectacularly heroic gesture of invading the scaffold at the last moment, no martyr ever attempted. Finally the fear complex which agitated the mental reactions of these Carmelites was in fact conspicuous by its absence. What then remains of history in the Dialogues? Nothing but the date, the place and the names used. Would it not have been as well if while resuscitating these noble women the severed heads had been restored to the shoulders to which they originally belonged? We look in vain for the intrepid Prioress who inspired and united the Community in its exalted desire to sacrifice life itself for Faith and country; who

demanded to be the last under the knife that she might support and encourage all the rest. Where is the novice who was the first to step forward singing *Laudate Dominum* as she placed herself in position without allowing the executioner's assistants to touch her? And there is so much else we should have liked to see, the two old nuns of nearly eighty, afraid at first to join the Community in their act of oblation, who a few hours after were pleading to be allowed to take part in it; the triumph of the nun who forced the judge to admit that it was for their religion that they were being condemned.

'As Benedictines of Stanbrook, we hold ourselves in some sort responsible for the preservation of the memory of these Carmelites of Compiègne. Our history closely touches theirs at this date. Our nuns were in prison with them and watched them from their barricaded windows, just as St Thomas More from his watched the Carthusians "as cheerfully going to their deaths as bridegrooms to their marriage". In our archives we have the written record of a nun who was there and whose words stood witness at the Process of Beatification, as they witness now to the high supernatural courage, nay more, the sanctity of these holy Carmelites.'

IN the first place we should like to know what the title of this film means. Unfortunately the name, *Le Dialogue des Carmélites*, does not really mean anything at all. Who thought of it? Across the outside of his manuscript Bernanos had written *Dialogues des Carmélites* simply as an indication that it contained his script for a film based on the book by the German novelist Gertrud von le Fort, *The Song at the Scaffold*. This is the story, as represented by her, of the martyrdom of the Carmelites of Compiègne in 1794.

The strange origin of Bernanos's text is well known: how Père Bruckberger and Philippe Agostini together had already drafted a scenario for *The Song at the Scaffold* when they asked Bernanos to write an appropriate dialogue for it. Brought out in 1949, it was first staged in Switzerland and then in Germany, before being brought to the Théâtre Hébertot in June 1952, where Albert Béguin and Marcelle Tassencourt were responsible for the staging.

Among dramatic critics it was generally considered that this production of the *Dialogues* was a fair success, although written in the first place for a film production. Luc Estang, the well-known *bernanosien*, wrote at the time in *La Croix* (31 May 1952):

The *Dialogues* would scarcely be suitable for the screen without adaptation. The text is too rich, too condensed and too spiritual to serve the medium, whereas the book itself is quite dramatic enough for the theatre, in spite of the fact that it was not written with the stage in view.

The play was a brilliant success, and even the most highbrow of *bernanosien* critics were satisfied that it was an authentic representation of Bernanos's thought. But the initial project still remained to be faced, that of producing a film. Several years went by and once again the same directors took it in hand. They found a producer sufficiently interested in the subject, and today Père Bruckberger and Philippe Agostini give us *Le Dialogue des Carmélites* which is their version of the *Dialogues des Carmélites* by Bernanos, which was itself based on Gertrud von le Fort's novel *The Song at the Scaffold*, or, as the French title has it, *The Last on the Scaffold*.

Technically this film is a work of high standing, it is most moving and well worthy, from every point of view, of a good reception by the public. For anyone who has read his book and also seen the play it is easy to imagine how Bernanos's work might have appeared on the screen. One would expect the importance of the historical events to recede before that of the inward struggle between fear and grace in the tortured soul of Blanche de la Force (in religion Sœur Blanche de l'Agonie-du-Christ)—*Fear and Grace* was in fact the title given to the German stage production. This struggle one would have thought all-important, and that picture after picture would illustrate Bernanos's theme: 'You see, in some way, fear too is a daughter of God, redeemed on Good Friday night . . . she stands by every death-bed pleading for mankind.' Bresson would have made the perfect interpreter of such a film.

The producers of *Le Dialogue des Carmélites* have worked from an entirely different angle which is equally praiseworthy. They have accentuated rather the course of the sufferings of the Carmelites of Compiègne as a community, by way of instructing, edifying and reaching the hearts of the people. At the very outset one is fully aware that the permanent state of terror in the soul of Blanche de la Force in the face of both life and death is not going to become the traumatic psychological case that Bernanos makes of it. The scene in his *Dialogues* which describes the cause of this state of things does not appear in the film. Henry Rabine, our special correspondent at the Cannes Film Festival, considers that those who have read Bernanos or seen the play may be put off by this change of emphasis. Not necessarily so, we think, because the aim of these producers is much less a personal spiritual adventure than a chapter in the 'lives of the saints'.

This chapter—and it is only a chapter—is written in the form of pictures which are of such stark beauty and keen power as to reach the heart of the most unimpressionable of spectators and compel admiration. This film should make an excellent sermon for any Christian. It provides many an inspiring subject for meditation without soaring to austere and arid mystical heights beyond the reach of the man in the street. Such scenes as the death of the first Prioress, whose tormented

last moments are made to be the pledge of Blanche's final victory over herself; the decision taken by the second Prioress, against the advice of her council in the community, to allow Sœur Blanche to continue her probation in their Carmel; Blanche's own flight in the hour of danger; and particularly all the last scenes, culminating in the slow procession up to the guillotine as each nun in turn asks permission from the Prioress to go to her death; then finally Sœur Blanche's willing sacrifice as she joins them, 'the last on the scaffold'. All these incidents touch the heart and raise the mind, however unready for such sublime teaching.

What is so pleasing about this film is its modest simplicity, combined with a true and deep spirituality. It seems right to us that the producers should somewhat forget Bernanos while remembering that the cinema—'art of the masses'—is more effective as an enormous picture-book than as a closely reasoned study. Even if the film does not entirely satisfy the keenest of *bernanosiens*, it will do more good than if it had kept closer to the idea of the author.

What must be regretted—for there are shadows—are the very defects of its many good points, a certain pandering to popular demand. Two or three times the producers are on the borderline of bad taste, as in the mime which takes place in the garden of the Palais Royal; and they blunder, as with the angelic choirs during the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday. The balance of emotional tension is disturbed by the substitution of the *Veni Creator* for the *Salve Regina* of the play. In point of fact it was the *Laudate Dominum* which the Carmelites sang at their execution.

But these are trifles. We cannot but thank Père Bruckberger and Philippe Agostini for having been mindful especially to bring their work within reach of the general public. They have done so without once lowering the standard, or diminishing its shining quality; nor is its simplicity ever jejune. Its achievement lies in having shown so clearly the psychological make-up of each of the characters, in a story which is as lovely as a legend, and, like a legend, accessible to all.

Another point worth noting is that the whole interpretation helps to engender an emotion mounting in intensity till the very climax. Perhaps the best actor of all is Georges Wilson as the Chaplain, a role which is unobtrusive but essential. Pascale Audret as Blanche at first seems a degree uncertain of her character, due, no doubt, to its confusing psychological trends. As the film progresses, however, she establishes herself, and this actress rises to the strength and the weakness that the personality of Blanche demands of her. Outstanding too is the acting of Anne Doat (Sœur Constance), and of Madeleine Renaud and Alida Valli, the two Prioresses. The last named particularly, in that she is so handicapped by her accent and yet masters her part to the end. Jeanne Moreau as Mère Marie de l'Incarnation almost succeeds in

making us forget the most recent plays in which we have seen her, and becomes the perfect Carmelite. We have here the work of a really great actress. We wondered what Pierre Brasseur would make of the Commissaire, but there is no need to fear; he plays this extremely difficult part with great delicacy, and never becomes obnoxious.

Thus have the *Dialogues* been filmed, and well may their high spiritual standard satisfy both *bernanosiens* and the rest of us, for surely the great thing is that thousands of spectators should thereby be encouraged 'to pray in the light of beauty'.

JEAN ROCHEREAU

Translated from La Croix

BOOK NOTICES

THE CHURCH IN SOUTH AFRICA

The Catholic Church in South Africa. By W. E. Brown. Edited by Michael Derrick. Pp. xiv + 351. (Burns and Oates. 35s.)

CATHOLIC GLASGOW, and some too of the other camp in that city, hold in honour the memory of Fr William Eric Brown, chaplain to the University from 1930 to 1945. He had lectured there in history as a layman from 1921 to 1924 and together with J. S. Phillimore had raised Catholic prestige to a high level by his intellectual contribution to the University. Born in Kent in 1893, he became a Catholic in 1919 after taking a degree in mathematics at London and serving with the Royal Artillery in France where he won the Military Cross. But he had been severely gassed in the war and his health was permanently undermined. Afterwards he read history at St John's, Oxford, and took a first there before going to lecture in that subject at Glasgow. But after three years he left for Ware to study for the priesthood and thence, his studies in philosophy completed, to the Scots College, Rome, to study theology. Whilst at Ware he had produced a workmanlike biography of Blessed John Ogilvie and now, while studying for a degree in theology, he again showed his capacity by writing *The Achievement of the Middle Ages*, and *Bishops*, two books in a series on the 'pioneers of

Christendom', and led in preparation of the evidence for Blessed John Ogilvie's beatification. After ordination in Rome and receiving his doctorate in theology at the Gregorian in 1930 he was incardinated in the Glasgow archdiocese as university chaplain. We cannot discuss his work there nor that for the seminarists at Bearsden, though it will be lastingly remembered.

Historical research had been continued in Rome and had caused him to be nominated Archivarius and Palaeographus of the Vatican library. He now contributed to Eyre's *European Civilization* articles on the Reformation in Scotland, and Christianity to the Edict of Milan. But after fifteen years of self-giving in the University ill-health made him resign his place as chaplain and seek relief for his lungs in the drier air of South Africa.

The bishops in that country earned our lasting gratitude by inviting him to write a history of the Church in South Africa. Dogged all the while by ill-health he yet managed to do all the necessary research and the bulk of the writing. What he has given us is perfectly done, a treasure pressed down and running over.

The bulk of the writing was done before death overtook him; his chapters required rearrangement and the whole work unification. He has been as lucky in his editor, Mr Michael Derrick, as were the South African bishops in their historian. Repetitions, caused by events already described but now discussed in connexion with new problems, are agreeably smoothed over, and a prologue and epilogue put the history (1837-1922) in its perspectives of before and after, since Dr Brown's work begins with the coming of the first resident vicar apostolic to Cape Town and ends with the coming of the first apostolic delegate. For his prologue the editor very properly relies on the authoritative work of Fr Sidney Welch, but there is more finesse to this short piece of writing than ever appeared in Dr Welch's own work. It is an admirable beginning. After a brief account of the visits of the Portuguese mariners to the Cape, and of their genuine religious zeal, the Dutch occupation of the Cape is described and the ruthless exclusion of Catholic settlers and priests. Things softened a little when de Mist, after the peace of Amiens, replacing the British garrison which had occupied Cape Town in 1795, restored Dutch rule in 1802 and published an ordinance granting religious toleration. But the British were back in 1806 under Sir David Baird, a good Scots Presbyterian who at once sent the three newly arrived Dutch priests packing. After 1814, when the British occupation was clearly to be permanent, attempts were made to provide clergy, but it was 1838 before the first resident vicar apostolic, the Dominican, Raymund Griffith, arrived. With his appointment Dr Brown's history begins.

Bishop Griffith's instructions were: 'Attend first to the wants of the children of the household of the faith. When the wants of this portion

of your flock have been provided for, turn your attention to the native population'. Given the severity of the Dutch discipline in excluding Catholics, one may wonder about the importance of the first clause. How long would it take to provide for the few Catholic residents who had managed to slip through? Yet it was nearly thirty years before the Oblates were at work in Basutoland, forty to Fr Mathieu's labours in Natal and to the coming of the Trappists to Dunbrody and their final settlement at Mariannhill. Already in 1688, when the Dutch settlement was barely thirty-six years old, Jesuits on their way to the East had reported that Catholics at the Cape were fairly numerous. Bishop Griffith was indeed to find a small body of those Catholics in his new vicariate, but so scattered were they and so unruly that his labours among them put us in mind of the labours of earlier missionaries, from St Paul onwards, bringing the Faith for the first time.

Inevitably, then, Dr Brown's history begins as an account of the first vicars apostolic and their work. Mercifully they kept diaries, records, memorials. And it is soon clear how fastidious is Dr Brown in his treatment of sources. Of one set of priest's memoirs, 'selected chiefly from his diary', he writes:

This priest wrote in such a vivid style as to suggest that he had a diary before him. And much of what he says dovetails with information supplied by others. But the 'chiefly' of the title is a warning, and the picture in his mind which would determine the colours, and even the selection, of incidents was that of a man after he had left the scene. He has certainly omitted some things which would tell against the perfect agreement between himself and his bishop.

If history should be, in Michelet's phrase, a resurrection of the flesh, Dr Brown has at least some measure of success. Bishop Griffith certainly comes alive. On his first going to the Cape he is presented reading two books on the power and duties of a bishop, and commenting after the first reading: 'I have no reason to plume myself on the character I have to exercise or the toil I have to endure.' But before settling down to episcopal questions he was going to read Homer, because 'when at school I disliked Greek so much I didn't attend to the story'. There were also in his boxes copies of *Udolpho* and *Peter Simple* which he finished before tackling the *Iliad*. 'His comments on books, as his choice of them,' Dr Brown observes, 'were far from conventional':

I finished Homer today, or rather his *Iliad*, which is a splendid piece of rank nonsense: his Nestor an old hag in breeches; only one or two affecting passages in the whole and these at the end; the Greeks (if we believe him at least) were, in the palmy days of their glory and civilization, not a whit better than the negroes in the

interior of Africa at the present day; nay, not half so merciful and human.

Next he is reading Bulwer's *England*:

There is much of the little boy in all his assumed manliness of criticism: he does not condescend to mention even Lingard, though Lingard catered so much to English bigotry in his history of England.

Dr Brown remarks: 'It is a just criticism of Bulwer, and Lingard's letters show that the guess about his method was not altogether inaccurate.'

The bishop found time too, after prayers, to play at backgammon, whist, cribbage with those on board, except on Sundays. But his sister was a nuisance: 'nothing could be more infelicitous than Margaret's play'; at backgammon, 'she is not always "honest in the game"'. 'The Scots would have called him forthright,' says Dr Brown, 'but the English would say irascible.' Yet the bishop's honesty is admired: he was always leaving valises or portmanteaux behind on his journeys and recovering them only after much fuss; 'I can never,' he writes, 'look after more than myself and one object at a time.'

The Catholics in the Colony were not rich, and they were scattered. Those at Cape Town were also torn by factions. Dr Brown's account of how the bishop ministered 'to those of the household of the faith' is uniformly interesting and readable. Schools had to be founded, churches built, clergy recruited, money raised, a Catholic paper started, the faithful and 'those who ought to be papists' (as the bishop described them) had to be visited over thousands of miles. It all sounds prosaic enough perhaps. But not as Dr Brown presents it; one is caught up in all the ancient anxieties, the hopes and fears and uncertainties—and the nausea. By land alone 'I have travelled in the Colony some 1100 miles,' Bishop Griffith writes at the end of his first tour, 'quite enough for the rest of my life. It cost me 135 pounds, mere travelling charges.' But he was fated to many more such tours.

Very soon it was evident that his vast vicariate must be divided. A new vicar apostolic was appointed, new clergy were recruited, new schools founded. This was to be the continuing pattern of events, and has been, one supposes, everywhere in missionary lands. How generous in quality as well as quantity was Ireland in particular in providing clergy, nuns and brothers! These vicars apostolic were men of culture, not infrequently seminary professors. The regular publications they produced were able and astonished the complacent Protestant society in which they appeared. The prestige of the Church rose immensely. With such men at the helm 'whether they [Catholics] like it or not,

they are credited with some of the prestige, influence, and formed policy which the Church exercises in different countries; and they are regarded as holding the tradition which formed the Europe of the Christian nations'. (Were these words, one wonders, coming fresh from Dr Brown's pen, or formulated in the Glasgow days when, with himself and J. S. Phillimore to provide the lead, Catholic prestige soared in the University?) Halls were full when the bishops lectured; Protestants no less than Catholics were anxious to hear them. 'A very able lecture,' says the Cape *Argus* of Bishop Grimley's address on the inspiration of the Scriptures, 'listened to with breathless attention by a numerous audience.' Their language, to our taste, was stuffy and pompous, but the Victorians relished it. 'From my earliest infancy,' Bishop Grimley was capable of saying, 'I entertained a predilection for the ecclesiastical state.' And in introducing a sacred concert in St Mary's Cathedral, after mentioning how the heroes of old, even Achilles, were musicians, how the art has an honoured place in the Old Testament and was used only for worship, how the angelic sons of the morning, Moses, Mary the Prophetess, King David and Solomon practised it, how the Christians made full use of it according to Pliny, Lucian, St Ignatius and St Cyprian, he gave a short description of the Ambrosian chant and then of the Gregorian chant, with references to its English exponents from Alfred to the time the Oxford degree in music was established in the reign of King John. 'Maybe,' says Dr Brown saltily, 'there were some valuable reflexions on each of the instances quoted, though time could not have allowed for many, and, as O'Haire remarked, the bishop was not himself a musician.' The peroration was recorded verbatim, with its concluding sentence before the concert began: 'I have done. Let the heavenly art speak for itself.'

Yet was the good bishop capable of an earthier language. We have his description of one of those innumerable tours in search of a scattered flock which must have exhausted the poor shepherds. The horses, he tells us, were quite unable to draw them out of the mountainside:

I had to walk. I put my cloak about me and walked before the horses. The rain falling in abundance soon saturated my cloak, my trousers and coat. The water flowed into my very boots. I walked wearily along. . . . At last we reached Nomads. I directed my steps towards Mr Fletcher's mat house. When near the house I fell prostrate on the earth. I soon arose, and found myself at the low entrance to Sandy's habitation—poor Sandy Fletcher, a Scotch Presbyterian, but a most kind-hearted man. I asked Fletcher at once for a trouser, saying that the life of a bishop was on his hands. He opened his box and took out a large, bright coloured trouser. I pronounced it first class, and soon had it on. I then asked for a coat and boots. He handed me a large, coarse white coat and boots, the leather of which never saw the tanner's yard. I looked at myself and

said, 'Well, if the Pope saw me now!' All the time the rain was falling, and dropping through the worn mats. I closed one large aperture by fastening against it a dried fish. Oh, that night I shall never forget . . . I expected a severe cold would have been the consequence . . . but thanks to my good God, who always protects the missionary, I did not experience the slightest bad effect.

All in all, is it any wonder that the Catholics of the Colony rallied to such pastors as these? When the new church was opened at Malmesbury, the choir came down from St Mary's Cathedral, Cape Town, and the bishop was welcomed with a salvo of cannon, twenty-one shots (the royal salute), fired in the church grounds. The solemn opening of this church was long remembered, but the bishop, always nervous about the susceptibilities of Protestants, was a little anxious. 'The inhabitants,' he wrote in his diary, 'were startled and perhaps alarmed at the whole proceeding.' He was not consoled, apparently, even by the notice of the *Advertiser and Mail*: 'The choir of St Mary's Cathedral, so long famed for transcendent musical talent, lent its valuable assistance on this auspicious occasion.' Many of the Protestants were as determined as he to be friendly. It was the hard core of Protestant resistance on which, rightly or wrongly, the bishop had his eye. But some of his clergy considered it a waste of time to be for ever soothing and placating these, and did not pull their punches in written and spoken apologetic. The bishop rebuked them, and in general, for fifty years or so, the spirit of unimpeachable but reserved gentlemanliness was maintained.

Though the Catholics of the Colony had been rallied, there were only a few thousand of them, and they were not rich. The early vicars apostolic were worried by a chronic lack of funds. 'We have had innumerable insolvencies,' wrote Bishop Grimley. He and others, says Dr Brown, did much to deserve the reputation which the Catholic clergyman was given by the nineteenth century, of always looking for gifts. But if they were beggars they were ever aware that it was Christ for whom they were begging and not themselves, and some of their gambits in the game are, frankly, astonishing. Bishop Grimley in an interview with Napoleon III, before he had come to his point which was to ask for funds, did not hesitate to tell the emperor: 'Latterly, I must say, your Majesty has descended in the estimation of Irishmen.' One notes today with surprise the generosity of the British Government at the Cape in paying salaries to the Catholic clergy; substantial grants were also made to the early schools. (All this was to change, later, as secularism first and then the intransigent Calvinism of the Boers prevailed.) We, who are habituated to the doctrine of the unbalanced budget, marvel how small were the debts which so alarmed them.

If Dr Brown brings some of the bishops back to life, he cannot be said to do the same for the laymen. Alexander Wilmot is a surprising

case in point. Dr Brown notices his eminence in the story of the Church in the second half of the last century, but he remains a shadowy figure, a voice. He had the reputation of being an interesting personality as well as a champion, and one would have been grateful for a closer study; material was readily to hand from his numerous sons, Fr Christopher Wilmot of Farm Street among them. He had a way of doing surprising things, not least in his own household; his ample fortune went at death not to his family, whom he had given a thorough education, but to charity—most of it, I fancy, to the Church. And certainly, if Fr Christopher was anything like his father, a few careful pages on Alexander Wilmot would have been rewarding. From the beginning the clergy had to rely on the layfolk in all manner of important matters (it has always been so), and from the beginning it is clear that an Aquila and Priscilla, even a Pomponia Graecina perhaps, were not lacking. But they are kept in a dim half-light. Absence of records may be the cause of most of this, but it can scarcely apply to Wilmot.

So also the human story of the multitude of religious who came to help the clergy from Ireland, France and Germany is not presented. They are recruited, they arrive, they teach. It is all seen through the bishops' eyes, except at Mariannhill and in Basutoland, where the achievement is so unusual and so immense that the omission cannot be made if the history is to be intelligible. Clearly, a rigid selection must be made, but I regret in particular the omission of so much in the extraordinary character and work of Sister Marie-Gertrude, the Assumptionist.

One therefore misses much of the flavour of life on the border, and one's appreciation of Bishop Ricard's work, and in particular of his imagination and zeal in the midst of so many difficulties, is diminished. What a versatile man he was, and what a worker! His apologetic and other writings alone would have kept most men fully occupied, but the bishop was looking ahead all the while and trying to shape the future. He arranged (and with what difficulty!) to bring the Trappists to the Eastern Province, and later arranged for them to go to Natal; he persuaded the Jesuits to enter Rhodesia. Dr Brown gives emphasis to his impulsiveness and to a certain melancholy in his later life. Is the emphasis not misleading? In 1891, after twenty-one years as bishop, in which he had spent himself energetically and generously, a letter came from Propaganda criticizing all the bishops for the deficiency in numbers and zeal of their clergy, the slow rate of conversions, the frequency of mixed marriages and the condition of Catholic schools. Coming from Italy, it was a curious document. Apart from the mixed marriages, it would have been more applicable to Turin or Naples, and even more applicable to most of France. But, as always in foreign parts, the document was taken seriously. The charge of negligence came as a surprise to Bishop Ricards and was indeed a bitter blow. His coadjutor,

Bishop Strobino, now occupied himself with implementing the implicit instructions of the men so many thousands of miles away, and Dr Brown assures us that he made Bishop Ricard's great projects viable and permanent. The innuendo is that Bishop Strobino was realist, and that a realist was what was needed. In fact, the great zeal of Ricards for the conversion of the Bantu, his careful study of their customs and institutions, are what deserve emphasis. Had his health and energy lasted longer, far greater work for the Bantu would have been undertaken than was entered upon by his successor. His failure in bringing the Trappists to Dunbrody is hammered home. But the real mistake was that the land he bought for them was, in the abbot's phrase, a place of thorns. We must remember that it was Ricards who brought them, and his instinct and imagination in bringing them was reliable, as their spectacular work was to prove. When it was clear that they could not stay at Dunbrody, he arranged for them to go to Natal, and he rejoiced that they had not been lost to the country, though lost to his own territory. He is, in my judgement, the greatest of all the missionary bishops of the last century in South Africa.

'When the wants of the children of the household of the faith have been provided for, turn your attention to the native population.' At half-way Dr Brown is describing the great work among the Africans at Mariannhill in Natal, and in Basutoland. At Mariannhill the Trappists had gradually to abandon their strict rule, as incompatible with the demands of missionary work. They taught the Faith, and also crafts and farming, to an enclave of Africans, and their success may be partly seen in the bitterness with which they were attacked by Protestants in the Press and the calumnies they had to endure. They were accused amongst other things of trying to make converts by bribery! But the abbot's quiet and reasoned replies in the Natal papers gradually won him the esteem and support of most. Things were particularly difficult because the Protestant missionaries, earlier in the field, had always been at loggerheads with everybody, as the fulminations from Exeter Hall sufficiently attest, and it had become a byword in the Colony that the raw native was better than the convert. Dr Brown impartially examines the evidence for this conclusion. Whatever may be said of the products of other missionary enterprise, it was clearly untrue of the pocket of Catholics at Mariannhill. 'We do not want the Kaffirs to be inspectors on the railways or station-masters,' wrote the abbot, '... but we want them to become good artisans and trustworthy agricultural labourers. A scientific explanation of the rules of English grammar, as well as an infinite number of standards, is totally unnecessary.' This was in 1889. He saw the need to train suitable children of the second generation to be teachers and administrators.

When they were first inspected, the officer urged the Government to make the schools there a grant 'as a simple act of justice, since the

Trappists were doing more than all other missionary bodies together; their proficiency in Zulu was far beyond the standards hitherto accepted, and the progress of their Bantu pupils in English could almost be described as wonderful; for the first time,' he added, 'the Trappists have proved that the Zulus can be both intelligent and applied.' Well might Bishop Jolivet write: 'Mariannhill is the envy of the Protestants, and I am proud of it.' It is one of those really great missionary enterprises which deserves the attention of all the civilized world.

But no less splendid was the work of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Basutoland. Here again the Protestants were earlier in the field. They did not relish the coming of the Oblates. (Indeed, the reading of Dr Brown's book would make sober and give pause to those who are so clamorous in denouncing the persecution of Protestants in South America and Spain.) The celibacy of the priests was urged against them in the court of the king. 'What,' asked Moshesh, the paramount chief, 'was the practice of the Lord Christ?' Moshesh had a genius for asking always the right question. So also when they complained of exaggerated honour paid to our Lady: 'Is the mother of the king not the queen in Basuto society and the most honoured of women?' Very slowly, but with greatest sureness, a third of the nation and more were brought within the fold. Today Basutoland boasts a Catholic university; the work of the Oblates here in providing wise rulers will benefit great areas of Africa. Impossible adequately to praise either their heroism through the years, or their vision.

The section on the Church and the Africans is the most fascinating part of Dr Brown's splendid work, and yet not altogether satisfying. He mentions the various schools of missiological thought but is evidently uneasy in this territory and does not arrive at judgement. Perhaps it is not possible to present the problem that *lobola* (bridewealth) and polygyny make for the missionary without first giving an account of the structure of the society in which they occur. The fact is that in tribal society economic, political, religious, legal and kinship institutions are so interrelated as to form a most sensitive unity. As a rule one cannot satisfactorily describe any one institution without showing its relation to the others. When Dr Brown cites with approval the opinion that polygyny is the *basis* of African society, he is seeing, as does the missionary at first glance, merely the chief impediment to evangelization. The various tribal institutions tend to stand to one another equipotentially. It is arbitrary to say that this or that one is 'basic' (it is the missionary's difficulty that is basic). Integral is perhaps a safer term. If one modifies a tribal kinship institution too radically, repercussions are at once likely to be felt in the economic and religious and other social life of the tribesmen. This explains in great measure why, as white civilization in Africa meets the indigenous social order, the African order often falls to dust; moral, religious and ancestral values going with it.

Men are presumably to be allowed to possess the Faith in their own cultural medium (St Paul's attitude to the Law and circumcision is to the point here), yet polygyny must go. The missionary has therefore to be something of an architect; those things in the social order which are buttressed by polygyny must somehow be buttressed still when polygyny has gone. Very careful investigation must precede any changes, for the ramifications can be most tangled and unsuspected. But the Faith is more than rich enough to supply, if only the missionary can be sure what is really needed. It is so difficult for us to strip away in our minds inessential cultural elements in which we of the West possess the Faith, and make room for those elements of African culture which we have no business to supplant. If we do not make the effort, the missionary is easily confused with representatives of the Western Governments. (This is the present fear in Nigeria: will the Faith be regarded as 'foreign' when independence is granted in October and be penalized accordingly? Some African religious fear that it will. We are shortly to see the success of our missiology in Nigeria judged.)

Had Dr Brown given a few pages to the structure of society in Basutoland, Fr Gerard's labours there would have appeared yet more remarkable. One could similarly have been better prepared by an introduction to understand the controversy on the Zulu catechism. How are we to put the Creed, with its refined theological concepts (*genitum non factum*, *consubstantialem*, etc.), into a tribal language? In Natal there was a special difficulty with *conceptus a virgine*. Dr Brown, summing up, says (what must surely be right) that 'pedagogically it would seem easier for a convert to start from a word already known and to give it a technical Christian meaning', rather than introduce a series of Latinisms round which the Zulu cannot get his tongue. But, alas, he is next approving those who would 'teach the Bantu to think white according to the psychological laws of the Western mind'! Did St Paul demand that the analytic mind of the Greek should now 'think Hebrew', in the synthetic and global manner of tribal Israel?

After an excursus into African society which is really too brief, we return to white South Africa where men like Dr Kolbe and Dr Welch were doing outstanding work. In this part, as everywhere else, Dr Brown's writing is felicitous. But is he not a trifle condescending in the passage on Kolbe? He misses, I believe, something of his greatness. Certainly we see nothing of Kolbe's great personal charm, and can only guess at his immense influence outside the Church. Smuts is described reading *Hamlet* on a political tour 'because I must be ready for Kolbe's interpretation', and we are told they were intimate friends, but that is all. Dr Brown mentions his training in science, law, philosophy, theology, but not that in letters (his formation was as long as that), yet for many his literary gifts were the most striking. In his approach to Shakespeare, he was years ahead of his day. (Imagine having to prove,

as he did in 1900 in a lecture in London to Shakespeare scholars, that Brutus is the hero of *Julius Caesar*!) With Kolbe, Moulton, Bradley and Mr Traversi behind us (and with an odd glance at Mr Dover Wilson and Mr Wilson Knight) we are surely in a position to plumb the riches of Shakespeare. Fr Christopher Wilmot, himself no mean preacher, assured me at the end of a very long life that Kolbe was the most eloquent man he had ever listened to. I can well believe it. No; for me Kolbe is the finest brain South Africa has produced—Smuts, I think, was of this opinion—and probably the greatest South African.

Lastly, in Mr Derrick's epilogue, we come to the sorrows of recent years, the triumph of the Nationalists and of apartheid. In his brief review of events the editor rightly gives prominence to the statements of the hierarchy; they are balanced and deserve careful scrutiny. Dr Brown had noticed from the beginning of his work that the segregation principle had not always been absolute in the Colony, nor marriages between blacks and whites forbidden. Andries Stockenstrom and his father make difficult cases for the doctrinaire Nationalist historian to explain, and there were countless others. But we are not fully prepared in this history for the triumph of the spirit of the North, for uncompromising Calvinism on the loose. Something lay between the easy-going South and this absolute intransigence: the Trek. Years of uncertain existence on the border and the subsequent trials of the voortrekkers; their isolation, their growing hostility to the British and finally the Boer War—all contributed to the spirit, so fierce, implacable and contemptuous which now confronts us. But I wish Dr Brown had given a few pages to the Trek; they would have helped to explain that spirit. The immolation of Retief and the atrocities of Weenen are indelibly inscribed in the mind of the nation; they have taken on a significance one can only call religious.

After a story so complex and problems so profound, presented in this book with lucidity and impartiality as never before, one reflects that in the Faith alone will the multiracial society of South Africa find its peace. In Mgr Hurley, the Archbishop of Durban, the Church has a leader and spokesman worthy of the crisis. But will even white Catholics have the courage to follow their undaunted leader? And yet, after Dr Brown's book, who will doubt the mighty energizing of the Spirit of God?

JOHN BERRELL, S.J.

THE POEMS OF TALIESIN

Canu Taliesin. Edited by Sir Ifor Williams. Pp. ix-xiv. 1-115. (University of Wales Press, 1960. 10s. 6d.)

THE publication of this work is calculated to set a man thinking how apt a phrase is Wittgenstein's 'grace of fate'; for the phrase hits off the sense one has in looking at a person's life and work that is all of a piece; one senses this very keenly on learning that the edition of the Taliesin poems has appeared in Sir Ifor Williams' seventy-eighth year, since it crowns a life devoted to elucidating early Welsh poetry. Such a field may seem a rather narrow one in which to spend all one's days, and Sir Ifor was well aware of the fact when he chose it; but he did so confidently because his profound belief in Providence assured him that each human being has a special task which no other person can fulfil quite so well. It was a belief that he made his own when in his youth he was compelled to spend two years on a bed of sickness from which he was not expected to rise. And all who stray into the field of early Welsh poetry are likely to sympathize with his belief for the difficulties in this poetry are so great that only a man with a mission would even attempt to solve them!

The first fruits of Sir Ifor's work were seen in 1935 with the publication of *Canu Llywarch Hen*. Three years later came his *Canu Aneirin*, the song to the men who had perished in the assault upon Catraeth in Yorkshire about the time St Augustine was at Canterbury. He presented us in 1955 with the poem *Armes Prydein*, a pan-Celtic war-cry from the tenth century directed against the conquering Saxons; and now we have the *Canu Taliesin*. These four works have transformed the study of Welsh literature.

Unfortunately the introduction and explanatory notes to all these volumes are in Welsh so that most people wishing to learn something of their content will have to turn to Sir Ifor's fine little book *Lectures on Early Welsh Poetry* (Dublin 1954). The use of Welsh for such scholarly works has been severely condemned by scholars outside Wales, and perhaps rightly; there is this to be said of it—that the Welsh universities are an expression of the ordinary people of the country, the quarrymen and miners, for instance, liberating themselves from oppression; and the English language has for generations been the symbol of the oppressors. Perhaps the time has come to ignore old scars, but the advice does not come well from the English.

The manuscript containing the *Canu Taliesin* is the one known as *Llyfr Taliesin* which is now in the National Library at Aberystwyth. The *Facsimile and Text of the Book of Taliesin* was published in 1910 by Gwengogryn Evans who dated the manuscript to about the year 1275.

In view of the lateness of the manuscript (1275) it will surprise no one to learn that remarkable erudition and skill are necessary to show how certain of the poems in it were composed about the year 600. One cannot do anything in this place to justify the attribution beyond saying that it has been accepted by the majority of competent scholars.

In the present work Sir Ifor begins by analysing the contents of the *Llyfr Taliesin*, listing the pages on which the various poems occur: death-songs, prophecies, religious and biblical verses, and so on. Some of these were composed about the year 900, others about 1000, and the difficulty for anyone trying to isolate the poems which were composed by Taliesin is that by the years 900-1000 legends had grown up about him, and compositions were being freely attributed to him such as he could never have dreamed of. However, out of this rag-bag Sir Ifor has managed to isolate some twelve poems which he is pretty confident to be the work of the Taliesin whom Nennius described as flourishing at the same time as the poets Aneirin, Talhaearn, Bard Blwch, and Cian Gwenith Gwawd.

The first of these twelve authentic Taliesin poems is in many ways the most interesting. It consists of twenty-five lines in praise of Cynan, the chief of Powys, who was son to Brochmael of the line of Catell. The line was supposed in some quarters to be descended from a slave, and certainly the nick-names they were given do not bespeak a family of refined aristocratic countenance. 'Ysgithrawg', 'with monstrous eye teeth', is the epithet bestowed upon Brochmael, whilst the term 'Carguinn' applied to Cynan also refers, probably, to some peculiarity in the shape of his jaw. If Taliesin is to be believed this peculiarity was matched in Cynan by an enormous appetite for the goods and submission of other princes; for he speaks of Cynan raiding into Anglesey, Gwent, Brecon, and South-West Wales, even threatening Cornwall. The poet, of course, regards all this buccaneering with approval because, apart from anything else, it brings gifts of horses, silver trappings, purple mantles, bracelets and swords to himself—and presumably to the other hangers-on at court. But it may well, as Sir Ifor suggests, have had disastrous results for the Powys dynasty since it meant that by the time Cynan's son, Selyf, had come to rule all the neighbouring princes had been driven into antagonism against Powys. Hence in 613, when the Northumbrians fell upon Chester, Selyf was left to face them alone, and the Northumbrians won a decisive victory. Not that there is any mention of Northumbrians in Taliesin's poem to Cynan, or indeed any mention at all of Saxon or Anglian enemies; in the late sixth century the Celtic rulers are still wrapped up in traditional rivalries between each other, unaware of the Teutonic storm about to break over them.

The next nine poems are all concerned in one way or another with Urien, prince of Reged, and his son Owain. Presumably Taliesin had by

now abandoned his allegiance to Powys and had emigrated into Urien's territories, he himself telling us that he was not originally a subject of Urien. What was the area over which Urien claimed domination is not easy to decide even after Sir Ifor's very full discussion of the possibilities, which cover the area from Galloway to Yorkshire. But we do find Urien being addressed as 'lord of Catraeth' and so can be confident that north Yorkshire paid him allegiance; and from this title we can also conclude that Urien's lordship there was earlier than the attempt to recover it recorded in the *Canu Aneirin*. Likewise Taliesin must have composed his songs before Aneirin. And in these songs there are frequent references to the new enemies of Anglian stock, to

the great host of Lloegr [that] sleeps
With eyes open to the light,
And those that were loth to flee
Were bolder than there was need.
Owain punished them fiercely
Like a pack of wolves worrying sheep.
A fine warrior in his many-coloured coat of mail,
Who used to give horses to minstrels.

One of the most revealing compositions in this group is the *Dadoluch Uryen*, or attempt on the part of the poet to propitiate Urien whom he had offended in some way. It is a sickly effort; we are told in it how rulers of every land were Urien's slaves and cringed before him, and one cannot help thinking that the words apply equally well to the poet himself. If this was the sort of thing the bards went in for then no wonder Gildas castigated them and their masters; even on purely human grounds they would have been better occupied in singing psalms instead of getting caught into this web of flattery.

The nature of Taliesin's offence, it is suggested by his editor, was to have sung highly laudatory verses at one time to a rival of Urien's, and the suggestion seems highly plausible when one comes to the last two of the poems in the series, two poems in praise of Gwallawg. Gwallawg was, like Urien, a descendant of old King Coel, and he also distinguished himself in the fighting against the Anglians, against Husa son of Ida; but almost inevitably he quarrelled with Urien, so that Urien was bound to be incensed when Taliesin spoke of the terror that Gwallawg inspired in Aeron (of which Urien himself was the protector). As Sir Ifor observes, the lot of the poet in that world was a perilous one!

The term used by Taliesin to describe Gwallawg's office is 'ygnat Eluet', magistrate of Elmet, which is the old kingdom in central Yorkshire where so much of our early history seems to lie buried. It is a title consonant with Gwallawg's other activities of ensuring peace from Dumbarton in the north to Caer Caradoc (Church Stretton) in the south, and even though one may be sceptical about the effectiveness

of Gwallawg's extensive peace, Taliesin's flattery does bring out one essential feature of this society that town-dwelling historians constantly fail to see. It was a society in which the leaders were for ever on horse-back scouring their territories, at all times on the watch for the incursions of their rivals; men such as Urien, Gwallawg and Cynan must have known the north and west as few men have known it since, not with the eye of a map-reader but with the guerilla leader's eye for the run of a river and the stretch of a forest. They are hardly to be understood in terms of modern Welshmen or Englishmen of any extant type, their closer kinship being with the Pathan tribesmen of the north-west frontier of India. What David Jones has said of a later prince, Hywel—that he was 'a young sheikh'—seems to me to hit off perfectly these earlier warriors; they were sheikhs.

But with one trace of difference that was eventually to lead to a society worlds apart from that of the tribesmen: Urien, Gwallawg, Owain and Taliesin were, in whatever peculiar way, Christians. At one time Sir Ifor Williams was inclined to attach little importance to the Christian terms in the poetry. But he now seems to take them more at their face value—after all, a society has to be fairly strongly impregnated with Christianity before its chiefs become 'rulers of the baptized' and its poets 'bards of the baptized', and there can be little ambiguity about the two Gwallawg poems beginning, *En enw gwledic nef*, 'in the name of the Lord of Heaven'. With these evidences, however, I am less impressed than with a phrase in the poem where Taliesin is creeping at the feet of Urien; no one, he says, will ever separate him from Urien, and then, whether as a conventional phrase or a sudden pang of remembrance, *namyn y duw uchaf*, 'except the high God'. *Namyn y duw uchaf*. Nisi Dominus.

DONALD NICHOLL

ON RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

Religious toleration in modern societies in which different religions co-exist—one of the subjects discussed in Rome in September at the Fifth International Thomist Congress—will be the subject of a paper by Mr N. St John-Stevan in the December number of THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

*The story of the
Knights of Malta*

The Last of the Crusaders

by Roderick Cavaliero

'Mr Cavaliero has a splendid institutional tale to unfold and he tells it excellently (His book is the perfect antidote to M. Roger Peyrefitte's scurrilous monkey-puzzle.) . . . His colourful account of a worthy machine running down is an unusual and Sitwellian piece of historical evocation.'

JOHN RAYMOND in *The Sunday Times*

30s.

HOLLIS & CARTER

For Publication on October 21st

OCCASIONAL
SERMONS
OF
RONALD A. KNOX

Edited, with an Introduction, by
PHILIP CARAMAN, S.J.

"Roman Catholic teaching and preaching at its brilliant best" was the generous tribute of *The Church Times* to *Pastoral Sermons*, the companion to this volume. It was typical of the enthusiastic welcome given by the Press generally.

Occasional Sermons should have an even wider appeal. Although "teaching" is implicit throughout, there is a human touch even more marked as it ranges over personalities, places and memories held in reverence or affection the world over.

This volume includes all the sermons that can be conveniently labelled "occasional". They fall into three groups—saints, occasions, and panegyrics. With the exception of nine sermons selected and edited by Mr Evelyn Waugh for the limited *de luxe* edition of Mgr Knox's sermons, none of the sermons in the third and fourth sections have hitherto been gathered into books. Twenty of the thirty-one sermons in the first and second sections have previously been published in book form under the title *Captive Flames* (1940), which has been unobtainable for many years. In the first and second sections the chronological order of the saints' lives has been followed; in the third and fourth sections the sermons are placed in the order in which they were preached.

440 pp.

Demy 8vo

42s.

BURNS & OATES